

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

LUCAN

DE BELLO  
CIVILI  
BOOK VII

EDITED BY PAUL ROCHE



## CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

---

### GENERAL EDITORS

P. E. EASTERLING

*Regius Professor Emeritus of Greek, University of Cambridge*

PHILIP HARDIE

*Senior Research Fellow, Trinity College, and Honorary Professor of Latin,  
University of Cambridge*

NEIL HOPKINSON

*Fellow, Trinity College, University of Cambridge*

RICHARD HUNTER

*Regius Professor of Greek, University of Cambridge*

E. J. KENNEY

*Kennedy Professor Emeritus of Latin, University of Cambridge*

S. P. OAKLEY

*Kennedy Professor of Latin, University of Cambridge*



LUCAN  
DE BELLO  
CIVILI

BOOK VII

EDITED BY

PAUL ROCHE

*Associate Professor of Latin, University of Sydney*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# CAMBRIDGE

UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,  
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107041707](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107041707)

DOI: 10.1017/9781107300569

© Cambridge University Press 2019

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2019

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ International Ltd. Padstow Cornwall

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

NAMES: Lucan, 39-65, author. | Roche, P. A. (Paul A.), editor.

TITLE: Lucan, De Bello Ciuili book VII / Paul Roche.

OTHER TITLES: Pharsalia. Liber 7 | Cambridge Greek and Latin classics.

DESCRIPTION: Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2019. | Series:

Cambridge Greek and Latin classics

IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2019006490 | ISBN 9781107041707 (alk. paper)

SUBJECTS: LCSH: Lucan, 39-65. Pharsalia. Liber 7.

CLASSIFICATION: LCC PA6478 .A2 2019 | DDC 873/.01-dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019006490>

ISBN 978-1-107-04170-7 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-107-61445-1 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

# CONTENTS

---

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>page</i> vi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	vii
Introduction	
1 <i>Book 7</i>	1
2 <i>Battle</i>	2
3 <i>The Gods and Religion</i>	5
4 <i>Stoicism and Epicureanism</i>	7
5 <i>Pompey and Caesar</i>	8
6 <i>Sources, Models, Intertexts</i>	11
7 <i>Viewing, Seeing, Spectatorship</i>	16
8 <i>States of Mind: Madness, Hope, Fear, Anger, Joy</i>	17
9 <i>Paradox and Hyperbole</i>	21
10 <i>Apostrophe</i>	23
11 <i>Sententiae</i>	25
12 <i>Diction, Word Order, Metre</i>	25
13 <i>Transmission and Text</i>	28
14 <i>Manuscripts Cited</i>	30
M. ANNAEI LVCANI DE BELLO CIVILI LIBER SEPTIMVS	31
Commentary	57
<i>Bibliography</i>	257
<i>Indexes</i>	
<i>Subjects and Names</i>	270
<i>Latin Words</i>	278
<i>Greek Words</i>	280
<i>Index Locorum</i>	281

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

---

Book 7 shows Lucan at his very best. I feel fortunate to have spent this extended period of time grappling with the language and the poetry of his account of Pharsalus; I hope that this edition might prove useful to other students and scholars wishing to do the same. It is a great pleasure to record my thanks and sincere appreciation for the many people who have helped me in the writing of this commentary.

I am most grateful to my editors, Philip Hardie and Stephen Oakley, who read and responded to successive drafts of comments and the introduction. They have saved me from many errors, sharpened countless notes and improved the overall quality of the edition many times over. I am indebted to them for sharing their knowledge of Latin literature with me so generously and for the time and care they have invested into my work. I would like to thank Michael Sharp and Mary Bongiovi at Cambridge University Press, and to express my appreciation to Iveta Adams for her superb copy-editing of the manuscript, which much improved its clarity and consistency.

Matthew Leigh was a wonderful host when I was a Plumer Research Fellow at St Anne's College, Oxford in 2011. The late Getzel Cohen warmly welcomed me as Tytus Fellow at the University of Cincinnati in 2014. In Sydney Bob Cowan, Frances Muecke, Anne Rogerson and Peter Wilson generously read and discussed discrete sections of the notes. Bob very kindly also read and commented upon the introduction and many other sections besides. In 2017 Emma Barlow read book 7 as part of her honours year and Anthony Alexander used a draft of this edition with his Latin reading group: both Emma and Anthony suggested a number of improvements to the manuscript in its late stages for which I am very grateful. Love as always to Clare, Beth and Julian.



## ABBREVIATIONS

---

Abbreviations of ancient authors and works follow the *Oxford Latin dictionary* for Latin and the *Oxford Classical dictionary* for Greek. Journals in the bibliography follow the conventions in *L'Année philologique*. In addition, the following list of abbreviations may be helpful.

A–G	J. H. Allen and J. B. Greenough (eds.), <i>Allen and Greenough's new Latin grammar</i> (New Rochelle, NY, 1992 repr.)
ASL	J. Endt (ed.), <i>Adnotationes super Lucanum</i> (Leipzig, 1969)
Barrington	R. J. A. Talbert (ed.), <i>Barrington atlas of the ancient world</i> (Princeton, 2000)
BC	Lucan, <i>De bello civili</i>
BMCRE	H. Mattingly, <i>Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum</i> , vol. 1: <i>Augustus to Vitellius</i> (London, 1923)
CAH ix <sup>2</sup>	J. A. Crook, A. Lintott and E. Rawson (eds.), <i>The Cambridge ancient history</i> , vol. ix: <i>The last age of the Roman republic, 146–43 BC</i> , 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1992)
Comm. Bern.	H. Usener (ed.), <i>M. Annaei Lucani Commenta Bernensia</i> (Leipzig, 1869)
Dilke	O. A. W. Dilke, <i>M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili liber vii</i> (Cambridge, 1960)
EV	<i>Enciclopedia Virgiliana</i> (Rome, 1984–91)
G–L	B. L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, <i>Latin grammar</i> (London, 1895)
Haskins	C. E. Haskins, <i>M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia</i> (Cambridge, 1887)
HE	M. Finkelberg (ed.), <i>The Homer encyclopedia</i> (Malden, Mass., 2011)
Housman	A. E. Housman, <i>M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis libri decem</i> (Oxford, 1926), comments <i>ad loc.</i> unless specified.
H–S	J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, <i>Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik</i> (Munich, 1965)
K–S	R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache</i> II: <i>Satzlehre</i> , 2 vols., 3rd edn rev. A. Thierfelder (Hannover, 1976)
Lanzarone	N. Lanzarone, <i>M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis liber vii</i> (Florence, 2016)
LIMC	<i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i> (Zürich and Düsseldorf, 1981–99)
L–S	C. T. Lewis and C. Short, <i>A Latin dictionary</i> (Oxford, 1879)

LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. Stuart-Jones, <i>A Greek-English lexicon</i> , 9th edn (Oxford, 1940)
LTUR	E. M. Steinby (ed.), <i>Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae</i> (Rome, 1993–2000)
MRR II	T. R. S. Broughton, <i>The magistrates of the Roman republic</i> , vol. II (New York, 1952)
N–H	R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, <i>A commentary on Horace: Odes book 1</i> (Oxford, 1970); <i>book 2</i> (Oxford, 1978)
NLS	E. C. Woodcock, <i>A new Latin syntax</i> (London, 1959)
NP	H. Cancik (ed.), <i>Brill's new Pauly: encyclopaedia of the ancient world. Antiquity</i> (Leiden, 2002–9)
N–R	R. G. M. Nisbet and N. Rudd, <i>A commentary on Horace: Odes book 3</i> (Oxford, 2004)
OCCL	M. C. Howatson (ed.), <i>The Oxford companion to classical literature</i> , 3rd edn (Oxford, 2011)
OCD	S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth and E. Eidinow (eds.), <i>Oxford classical dictionary</i> , 4th edn (Oxford, 2012)
OLD	P. G. W. Glare (ed.), <i>Oxford Latin dictionary</i> (Oxford, 1982)
Postgate	J. P. Postgate, <i>M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili liber VII</i> (Cambridge, 1917)
RE	A. F. von Pauly (ed.), <i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , rev. G. Wissowa <i>et al.</i> (Stuttgart, 1893–)
RIC	C. H. V. Sutherland, <i>The Roman imperial coinage</i> , vol. I, rev. edn (London, 1984)
SB	D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), <i>M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri X</i> (Leipzig, 2009)
TLL	<i>Thesaurus linguae Latinae</i> (Leipzig, 1900–)
VE	R. F. Thomas and J. M. Ziolkowski (eds.), <i>The Virgil encyclopedia</i> (Malden, Mass., 2014)
Weber	C. F. Weber ( <i>et al.</i> ) (ed.), <i>Marci Annaei Lucani Pharsalia</i> (Leipzig, 1821)

# INTRODUCTION

---

## 1 BOOK 7

Book 7 treats the decisive encounter between the armies of Caesar and Pompey at the Battle of Pharsalus, which took place on 9 August 48. The whole book is devoted solely to this event and its aftermath, a period of a little more than 24 hours.<sup>1</sup> When *BC* 7 begins, the reader's attention has already been focused on the region near Pharsalus for nearly 500 lines: at 6.332 Pompey arrives in Thessaly in pursuit of Caesar, at 6.333–412 Lucan gives an excursus on the geography of the region and at 6.413–830 he narrates the encounter between Sextus Pompey and the witch Erichtho. The proportion of narrative concentrated upon one place, as well as the amount of space given over to the circumstances and aftermath of a single event, are unique within the poem.<sup>2</sup>

The events of book 7 may be set out as follows:

1–6	The sun reluctantly rises.
7–44	Pompey dreams of being applauded in his theatre at Rome.
45–61	Pompey's camp demands that he give battle to Caesar.
62–85	Cicero urges Pompey to fight Caesar.
85–127	Pompey relents and agrees to give battle.
127–50	Pompey's camp responds with commotion and fear. They prepare their weapons and are compared to gods arming for battle against giants.
151–84	Portents of disaster assail the Pompeian forces.
185–213	In Patavium the augur Cornelius foresees the outcome of the battle. The narrator predicts (201–13) that when the events of his poem are read they will provoke hope, fear and prayers in his readers: they will seem like events that have not yet occurred and they will elicit support for Pompey.
214–34	The arrangement of the Pompeian forces.
235–49	Caesar sees the Pompeians descend to the plain.
250–329	Caesar exhorts his soldiers to battle.
329–36	Caesar's camp eats, arms itself and rushes to battle in no order.
337–84	Pompey exhorts his soldiers.

<sup>1</sup> Lines 712–27 are the exception, when attention shifts momentarily to Larisa.

<sup>2</sup> Any summary of the poem's events, e.g. Dinter 2012: 5–8 or the structural schemes set out in Radicke 2004, will show the typical pattern of narrating multiple events and locations within a single book.

385-459	The troops charge at each other. The narrator reflects on the permanent consequences of the battle (387-459): the loss of future Roman generations; the depopulation of Italy; the cessation of Roman imperial expansion; the loss of liberty. If Jupiter will watch Pharsalus without intervening, Rome has her revenge by deifying emperors.
460-505	The battle begins. Crastinus casts the first spear; hand-to-hand combat ensues.
506-44	The Pompeian cavalry is routed.
545-56	The centre of the battle, where Romans fight Romans. The narrator refuses to tell of this part of the battle.
557-85	Caesar in the centre of battle.
586-96	Brutus.
597-616	The death of Domitius Ahenobarbus.
617-46	The narrator passes over individual deaths and bitterly denounces the battle as bringing permanent slavery to Rome.
647-97	Pompey's flight.
698-711	The narrator apostrophizes Pompey.
712-27	Pompey at Larisa.
728-60	The Caesarians take Pompey's camp.
760-86	Caesar and his soldiers dream of their victims.
786-824	The next morning Caesar views the dead as he eats breakfast; he refuses them burial.
825-46	The dead are plundered by carrion animals.
847-72	The narrator apostrophizes Thessaly.

The individual scenes listed above may be grouped into four larger panels of roughly equal length: (i) Pompey's camp (1-213); (ii) Caesar and Pompey on the plain (214-459); (iii) the battle narrative (460-646); (iv) Pompey's flight and the aftermath of battle (647-872). Each panel ends with a major interjection by the narrator in which the enormity of the battle is conveyed to the reader. Different divisions between groups and other larger structural patterns are of course possible; a broad division into three panels – before (1-213), during (214-646) and after battle (647-872) – is another obvious pattern.<sup>3</sup>

## 2 BATTLE

The space that Lucan devotes to the events in Thessaly is a sign of their importance, but the battle narrative itself is only a small proportion of this

<sup>3</sup> Supported by e.g. Radicke 2004: 374 and Lanzarone 1-4.

whole (less than a quarter of book 7; about one seventh of the narrative based at Thessaly at 6.333–7.872). Moreover, the manner in which it is presented illustrates a number of idiosyncrasies at work within *BC*.

The Battle of Pharsalus was promised in the first line of the poem as its subject matter (1.1 *Bella . . . per Emathios . . . campos*). It is repeatedly anticipated: foreseen (1.679–82), foreshadowed (1.38–9, 3.296–7, 4.255–6, 4.803–4, 5.391–2, 6.62) and marked as fated (6.313, 6.332). However, in keeping with the expansive and digressive nature of epic narrative, the decisive encounter between the poem's protagonists is delayed for six books.<sup>4</sup> Even within book 7 the battle itself is postponed for over 400 lines. In *BC* the narrative strategy of delaying Pharsalus moves in step with the historical Pompey's military strategy of falling back before Caesar's invasion of Italy, of blocking his supplies, effectively prolonging the war and avoiding a decisive encounter with Caesar.<sup>5</sup> Delay in *BC* is more importantly bound up with the narrator's overall determination to retard Caesar's march to victory, since that will mean the permanent loss of liberty for Rome (cf. e.g. 1.670 (Figulus) '*cum domino pax ista uenit*').<sup>6</sup> Whereas in the *Aeneid* delay is typically orchestrated by divinities, in *BC* delays are more commonly caused by the poem's narrator. Freightening this common narrative strategy with a heavy ideological load is one of Lucan's most conspicuous contributions to epic narration.<sup>7</sup> As in earlier epic, the motif of delay gains further prominence as the summative encounter draws near. A comparison of the theme and vocabulary of delaying in *Aeneid* 12 is instructive.<sup>8</sup> In *BC*, the terms *mora* or *morari* occur five times in book 7, all before the battle proper begins: this is about a quarter of their occurrences in the poem when applied to the progress of Caesar or the war;<sup>9</sup> in the same way, about a quarter of these words' occurrences within the *Aeneid* are found in book 12.

Within book 7 itself this process of delay is reflected both in the sun's reluctance to rise and in various explicit comments made by characters: for example, at 82 Cicero accuses Pompey's *signa* of being *morantia*; at 87–8 Pompey disavows further delay in a manner evoking Virgil's Turnus; at 240 Caesar is sick of delay; at 338 Pompey sees that no further delays are

<sup>4</sup> On delay as a 'generator of epic plot' see Hardie 1997: 145–7; cf. Fowler 1997: 16–17.

<sup>5</sup> On the republican strategy in the civil war see Welch 2012: 43–91.

<sup>6</sup> Masters 1992: esp. 1–10; index s.v. 'delay (*mora*) of narrative'.

<sup>7</sup> Its influence can be felt, for example, in Statius' use of delaying the climactic *nefas* of fratricide in the *Thebaid*: see Vessey 1973: 165–7; Feeney 1991: 338–40; Ganiban 2007: 152–75.

<sup>8</sup> See Hardie 1997: 145; Tarrant 2012: 3–4.

<sup>9</sup> I count twenty-three such occurrences (out of thirty-five total appearances); I disregard examples describing natural phenomena (e.g. rivers) although these instances may still contribute to the thematic importance of delay in the poem.

permitted; at 460 the plain separating the onrushing armies is described as ‘delaying destiny’. After book 7 the frequency of these terms declines radically.<sup>10</sup> Delay in the *Aeneid* is one means of drawing attention to the closural force of Turnus’ death: of postponing the climactic encounter, of generating suspense and of allowing space for themes to develop which deepen the reader’s understanding of the end of the poem.<sup>11</sup> We can attribute these same effects to delay in *BC*, albeit without the closural force which the theme brings with it in the *Aeneid*.<sup>12</sup>

When the battle finally does commence the theme of delaying gives way to that of omission and silence. The most extreme example is the narrator’s flat refusal to recount the action at the centre of battle where Romans fight Romans (545–56; esp. 556 *quidquid in hac acie gessisti, Roma, tacebo*).<sup>13</sup> Before and after this moment several standard scenes and elements found in epic battle narratives are conspicuous by their absence.<sup>14</sup> There is no example of a full-scale *aristeia* of Pompey, Caesar or individual warriors in the Homeric and Virgilian manner: the narrator explicitly states that he will not recount *singula fata* at 617–31.<sup>15</sup> A full-scale arming scene such as one encounters in the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* is withheld; instead the Pompeians collectively prepare their weapons for battle at 139–43, and we are simply told of the Caesarians at 330 *armaque raptim | sumpta*. The only individual death scene in the book is that of Domitius Ahenobarbus at 597–616. This conforms to a well-established generic pattern that renders Domitius a problematic emblem of dying senatorial freedom and suggests a model of behaviour for Pompey, heroic death in battle, that he fails to emulate (see 597–616n.). Lucan moreover does not narrate any encounter between named individuals on the plain, a basic component of Iliadic battle. The omission of a confrontation between the poem’s protagonists, Caesar and Pompey – averted by the latter’s flight from Pharsalus at lines 677–9 – may count as *BC* 7’s most striking

<sup>10</sup> Once in each of books 8–10 applied to the war, five times in total. It is idle – and contingent upon one’s view of the poem’s intended structure – to speculate whether the theme might have been reprised as the narrative got closer to Thapsus.

<sup>11</sup> Semple 1959: 182; Tarrant 2012: 5. Leigh 1997a: 86 n. 16 notes also how attention to the anticipatory emotions, such as hope and fear, intensifies as the battle approaches.

<sup>12</sup> One could argue that Lucan’s adaptation of this Virgilian closural device at a point in his poem when so much of its narrative remains serves the overall theme of the endlessness of civil war, on which see Masters 1992: 247–59; Day 2013: 93–8.

<sup>13</sup> Lebek 1976: 253–4; Johnson 1987: 97–100; O’Higgins 1988: 215–16; Masters 1992: 148; Leigh 1997a: 101–3.

<sup>14</sup> Bramble 1983: 543 ‘a book singularly lacking in Homeric or Virgilian narrative action’.

<sup>15</sup> Gorman 2001: esp. 267–72 on Pharsalus.

omission in view of its numerous pointers to *Iliad* 22 and *Aeneid* 12; the ensuing pursuit by Caesar throughout the eastern Mediterranean will be resolved only in the harbour of Alexandria at 9.1010 where Caesar will be presented with Pompey's head. The preceding discussion is not to say that common details from epic battle narratives are completely lacking. These can be found, for example, in the blaze of bronze armour (2.14–15) and motifs such as the 'first spear cast' in the battle (4.72–3) or the 'cloud of weapons' (5.19). But the reader's generic expectations are more typically frustrated than fulfilled in book 7.

While many elements within Lucan's Pharsalus narrative are atypical of earlier epic, there is much in his description of battle at 460–646 that is characteristic of his own earlier battle narratives. Pompey's squadrons, so densely packed that they can hardly wield their swords (4.92–5), recall Curio's crowded forces under attack at 4.777–83. The reader is well prepared for the focus on amputation wounds, dismembered and disintegrating bodies (at e.g. 6.19–30) by the 'amazing sights of varied deaths' (3.634 *uarii miracula fati*) recounted in the sea battle at Massilia (3.635–751) or at the siege at Dyrrachium (e.g. 6.175–9).<sup>16</sup> The narrator's attention to blood flowing, congealing or being dammed at the site of battle (e.g. 6.36–7) is similarly familiar from the same details at 3.572–3 and 4.785 (cf. also the effects of mass execution at 2.209–20).

### 3 THE GODS AND RELIGION

Divine participation in epic narratives, including those treating historical subjects, was a standard feature of the Greek and Roman tradition.<sup>17</sup> Lucan breaks from this pattern in three important respects. First, at the beginning of the poem he does not invoke the Muses for their assistance (cf. Virg. *A.* 1.8–11); instead he opts for the poetic inspiration of the emperor Nero at 1.63–6. Second, he cites no divine causation for the civil war in his proem (cf. Virg. *A.* 1.4); only at 2.1–4 does he reveal that the anger of the gods was made manifest in the prodigies of 1.469–695. Third, Lucan does not show divine characters in speech and action throughout the course of his epic.<sup>18</sup> This strategy has a number of consequences. Lucan's narrator, characters and readers are denied access to one of epic's 'most powerful and economical frame[s] of reference':<sup>19</sup> the gods do not justify,

<sup>16</sup> On Lucan and the human body see Most 1992 (on Neronian poetry more generally); Bartsch 1997: 10–37; Dinter 2012.

<sup>17</sup> For a survey of the evidence and issues see Liebeschuetz 1979: 140–55 and esp. Feeney 1991: 269; cf. 264–9.

<sup>18</sup> Early exceptions are the appearance of *Patria* to Caesar at 1.185–203 and the Fury who hovers over Rome at 1.572–7; see Feeney 1991: 270–3.

<sup>19</sup> Feeney 1991: 285.

condone or interpret the poem's outcome in their own words as they do in Homer and Virgil. In the Roman epic tradition, the foundation of Rome or its hegemony over the Mediterranean is endorsed by an accommodation made between opposed gods, such as the reconciliation of Juno and Jupiter at Virg. *A.* 12.791–842. Such a framework was available to Lucan: the Roman civil war could have been mirrored in a divine conflict between Caesar's progenitor Venus and Hercules, whom the republicans had promoted as the divinity of their cause.<sup>20</sup> Petronius' poetaster Eumolpus adopts precisely this strategy in his own poem on the civil war when Venus, Minerva and Romulus are shown to support Caesar while Apollo, Diana, Mercury and Hercules support Pompey (124.264–70). A divine apparatus of this kind – requiring Caesar's ultimate victory over the republicans to be endorsed by an accommodation between Hercules and Venus and met with the approval of the pantheon of gods – would be irreconcilable with the narrator's position as an entrenched opponent of Caesar and the principate.<sup>21</sup>

Lucan's rejection of the assistance of the traditional muses means that he forgoes the omniscient authority typical of the epic narrator. We can see his performed ignorance foregrounded at a number of points in the poem (e.g. multiple, alternative explanations at 19–24; doubt at 172–3; reliance upon the *fides* of those *memorantes* at 192). The existence of the gods is assumed in the poem – and is evident e.g. in the appearance of omens and prodigies (151–84) or in augury (192–200) – but their influence over events is always observed from the perspective of human experience. Prayers and invocations of the gods are very frequent in *BC* but the efficacy of human prayer has to be inferred from the outcome of events on earth. Caesar's inexorable path to victory in the poem thus points to his divine support.

*BC*'s theodicy is clearly announced at 1.128 *uictrix causa deis placuit sed uicta Catoni*, but the manner and reasoning of this theodicy are obscure to the narrator and withheld from the human protagonists of the poem. Cicero believes that divine support for the republican cause is a given (76–7). Pompey on the other hand recognizes that the day has been appointed by the gods in answer to the prayers of Caesar (113–14; cf. 339). Although he suspects that they have betrayed him (85–6), he still believes (or claims) that the gods have preserved him in order to defeat Caesar and protect the laws (349–55). After his cavalry is defeated,

<sup>20</sup> App. *BCiv.* 2.76.319 records that the night before Pharsalus the watchword for the Pompeians was 'Hercules Invictus', while that for the Caesarians was 'Venus Victrix'. Jal 1963: 194–5; Ahl 1976: 286. For Pompey and Hercules more generally see Rawson 1970.

<sup>21</sup> On Lucan's deeply engaged, partisan narrator see Masters 1992: 5–6, 87–90; D'Alessandro Behr 2007: esp. 1–15.



Pompey realizes that the gods have abandoned him (646–9), but even now believes in the efficacy of his prayers (657–66). In contrast, Pompey's decision to fight demonstrates to Caesar his divine support: the battle answers his prayers (238–9) and he sees the gods draw close to him in the imminent battle (297–8). His prayers for victory at 311–14 are answered and at 796 he 'sees fortune and his gods' in the post-battle carnage.

Those on the losing side of history are frequently baffled or outraged at the epic's unfolding events, most typically the poem's narrator. Evidence of the gods' support for Caesar or their indifference to the republicans or Pompey often evokes reproaches against them (e.g. from the people of Larisa at 725). The most elaborate example occurs at 445–59 where, after reflecting upon the permanent consequences that will follow from the battle, the narrator exclaims in quick succession that there are no gods for the Romans (445–6), that Jupiter's sovereignty is a lie because all things are swept along by chance (446–7) and that human affairs are of no concern to Jupiter because he is able to watch the bloodshed without casting his thunderbolts (447–54).

#### 4 STOICISM AND EPICUREANISM

*BC* is pervaded by the conflicting tenets of Stoicism and Epicureanism.<sup>22</sup> The most significant point of difference between these two philosophies concerns the Stoic notion of a universe governed by a benevolent divinity and subject to the fates, and the Epicurean belief in detached, uncaring gods and events unfolding according to random chance.<sup>23</sup> In *BC* this opposition is stated most explicitly at 2.7–13,<sup>24</sup> but is revisited at many points in the poem. Neither the narrator nor many of the human characters of the poem – with the notable exception of Cato (cf. 9.566–84) – know whether the events of the poem occur by design or chance; and this uncertainty is felt at many discrete moments. A further complication is that the terms *fata* and *fortuna* are frequently used in close proximity (cf. e.g. 88–9, 205–6, 250–2, 504–5, 600–1, 647–9, 686): usage which is in keeping with the Stoic tendency to call the same organizing principle of their universe by multiple names (see 1n.), but which in *BC* has the effect of forestalling attempts to differentiate destiny from chance events.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Long and Sedley 1987 provide key sources with commentary for both schools. For orientation on Stoicism see *OCD* s.v. 'Stoicism' and the essays in Inwood 2003; for Epicureanism see *OCD* s.v. 'Epicurus', the essays in Warren 2009 and Kenney 2014: 1–5.

<sup>23</sup> The actual role and importance of chance in Epicurean physics is debated: see Long 2006.

<sup>24</sup> Feeney 1991: 281; Fantham 1992: note on Luc. 2.1–66n.

<sup>25</sup> Feeney 1991: 280. For *fatum* and *fortuna* in *BC* see Friedrich 2010; Dick 1967.

The world of the poem is often described in essentially Stoic terms:<sup>26</sup> in *BC* 7 the *lex aeterna* (1) and the fates ‘dragging’ the world along as Pompey’s camp demands war (46) both evoke the predetermined universe of the Stoics; that the sun is fed by vapour from the ocean is also a Stoic belief (5). Pompey tries to dissuade his camp from battle with essentially Stoic aphorisms at 105–7, while Caesar seems to allude to the cosmic sympathy by which Pharsalus was brought to pass at 301. Furthermore, when at 211 the narrator predicts the emotions that his poem will arouse in its future readers (*spesque metusque simul perituraque uota*), relevant to his claim is the Stoic belief in the beneficial arousal of fear and pleasure by poetry in its audience.<sup>27</sup> Conversely, the narrator refers to the Epicurean belief in divine disinterest in human concerns at various moments in book 7: Pharsalus distracts the care of the gods from the heavens at 311–12; the fact that the battle takes place without intervention by the gods prompts the narrator to an impassioned denial of divine concern for the Romans and an affirmation that events are swept along by chance (445–7, 454–5).

Stoic and Epicurean beliefs regarding death also offer important context for *BC* 7. At 470–1 the narrator prays that the gods give Crastinus not death but post-mortem sensation: i.e. a fate contrary to the Epicurean position that the dissolution of the soul’s union with the body at the point of death marked the end of sensation.<sup>28</sup> After the battle, the narrator assures Caesar that the bodies of the dead to whom he denies burial will be received back into the earth (810–11, 818–19): a position that was not exclusive to Epicureanism but had been forcefully stated by Lucretius (2.999–1003). Shortly after, the narrator turns to Stoic alternatives: the dead will be consumed in ekpyrosis (812–15, alluded to earlier at 136) and they will achieve astral immortality (816).

## 5 POMPEY AND CAESAR

Pompey’s psychological profile in *BC* is more complex than that of either Caesar or Cato. Scenes such as 5.722–815 and 8.560–636 stress the loving, human relationship he has with Cornelia, and he generally occupies a more moderate, fallible position between the extremes of Caesar and Cato.<sup>29</sup> His essential characteristics are established in his introduction

<sup>26</sup> See Lapidge 1979.

<sup>27</sup> D’Alessandro Behr 2007: 76–8.

<sup>28</sup> See e.g. Kenney 2014 on Lucr. 3.839–42.

<sup>29</sup> For major discussions on Lucan’s Pompey see Ahl 1976: 150–89; Johnson 1987: 67–100; Bartsch 1997: 73–100; Leigh 1997a: esp. 110–57; Narducci 2002: 279–367; Sklenář 2003: 106–27; Day 2013: 179–233. Also important is Feeney 1986b, who inter alia draws attention to Lucan’s habit of punning on Pompey’s cognomen *Magnus* with various adjectives denoting greatness or its opposite.

to the poem at 1.129–43:<sup>30</sup> he is older, mellowed by civil life, a populist reliant upon his past successes. The oak tree to which he is compared at 1.135–43 illustrates both his frailty and the esteem with which he is regarded by his community. In *BC* 7, although he believes he has the better cause (349), and lays claim to the support of the gods (349–55), he vacillates between confidence in victory and despair (despair at e.g. 89–92). He makes at times shocking concessions and compromises, especially in his speeches: he would gladly die from the first javelin cast if it did not mean ruin for the republican cause (118–20); he would grovel before his soldiers' feet if he could do so with his dignity intact (378–9); he will suffer exile, not death in defeat (379–80); he may learn to serve Caesar (382). His desire for popular approval is marked early in the book (in his dream at 9–12; in his concern for his name at 120–3) and the love felt for him by the city is made clear e.g. at 28–44.<sup>31</sup> This desire to be loved sets him apart from the other heroes of the poem. His love of Cornelia partially motivates his flight (675–7), and he presumes that familial love drives his soldiers: he urges them to win back family life with the sword at 346–8 (contrast Caesar, who orders his troops to summon fate with their sword at 252). Pompey has a vanity which at times borders on self-absorption: at 354–5 the fact of his existence is proof to him of the gods' support for his cause and at 671–2 he fears that if he falls in battle his whole army will die over his body. Pompey has a complex relationship with his soldiers. To his rank and file, as to his more exalted allies, his strategy appears to stem from personal ambition rather than disinterested reasoning: to them he is slow, timorous (52; 68–75, 78) and addicted to world-rule (53–5). His control over his camp is tenuous (45–127) and his catastrophic concession to the army on the issue of fighting Caesar at Pharsalus is marked by a simile illustrating his abnegation of authority (cf. esp. 125–7).

Nevertheless, the concern of his camp for him is made clear (133–8). Pompey is a failure as an orator (337–84; cf. 2.531–95, 8.262–327). He is repeatedly cast in the mould of an experienced general pursuing a sensible strategy, undermined by the impatience and inexperience of his subordinates (45–61; cf. 647–97); his decision to flee battle rather than to rally the troops or die heroically sits in contrast to this pattern. In his flight Pompey's desire to limit casualties (656–8, 689–91) at once speaks to his compassion and to a basic misunderstanding of the ideological conviction of his troops (694–7). The portrait of the courageous,

<sup>30</sup> For the introduction of Pompey and Caesar at 1.135–57 see Rosner-Siegel 1983.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Pompey's abiding concern for his *fama*, which remains a priority as he faces his death at 8.622–35.

self-contained man who flees from battle is, presumably, scathingly ironic (680–6).

Caesar's characterization stands in contrast to that of Pompey.<sup>32</sup> In *BC* 7 his portrayal as a force of unstoppable, destructive energy and overreaching ambition, established at 1.143–57, is amply confirmed. He craves the summative confrontation that Pompey seeks to avoid (239); he is sick of delay and possesses a burning desire for power (240–2). His confidence in divine support prior to the battle (e.g. 297–9) is answered by his 'seeing his gods' in the carnage on the following morning (796). Whereas Pompey looks for compromise, Caesar pursues an absolutist, 'all or nothing' approach. Defeat means death (305); if his soldiers so much as look back before victory he threatens to commit suicide (304–10). This attitude is well symbolized in his order to destroy their own camp before battle (326–9).<sup>33</sup> Whereas Pompey appeals to family ties, Caesar repeatedly and graphically urges his soldiers to ignore such bonds of *pietas* in battle (320–5). Caesar acknowledges (or claims) his reliance upon his soldiers: it is they who will 'summon fate' for him (252); his soldiers are strongly assimilated to him by their outlook and description (320–2, 332–3, 334–6nn.) and by the arresting comparative image of his army being comprised wholly of him (334–6). Above all, Caesar is in control of his soldiers in a way that Pompey is not. He efficiently stirs them to action (329–36); he becomes an almost super-human agent of their frenzy in the midst of battle (557–85); he can stop their killing (730–1) and redirect their energies (albeit to plundering) after the battle has been won (731–7, 746–9). Caesar's characterization is extreme but not unchanging. Before battle we see a moment of doubt and hesitation (245–7) and Caesar suppresses a feeling of dread before he addresses his troops at 248, just as Pompey does at 339–41. After the battle, he is subject to the same guilt, mental turmoil (779) and harrowing dreams as his soldiers (771–6). Be that as it may, the lasting image of Caesar from book 7 comes from the morning after Pharsalus: his diabolical delight in the carnage (794–5); his lingering gaze over the bodies; his unabated *furor* (797) and *ira* (809), which motivate his denial of burial to the dead.

<sup>32</sup> For Lucan's Caesar: Ahl 1976: 190–230; Henderson 1987: 141–51; Johnson 1987: 101–34; Narducci 2002: 187–278; Sklenář 2003: 128–51; Day 2013: 106–78.

<sup>33</sup> And chimes with other self-destructive imagery associated with Caesar in *BC*: e.g. 1.151–7, lightning raging against its own precinct of the sky; 1.205–12, a lion thrusting itself on hunting weapons.

## 6 SOURCES, MODELS, INTERTEXTS

*Caesar*

*BC* has often been read as responding to Caesar's own account of the civil war, although not all scholars have accepted a direct relationship between the two texts.<sup>34</sup> The events of book 7 correspond to *Civ.* 3.82.2–99.5 and should be read as illuminating by contrast Lucan's own thematic emphases.<sup>35</sup> It is furthermore a priori highly probable that Lucan used Caesar's account and that his version of events responds antagonistically to the *Commentaries* in the same manner as it does to the *Aeneid*, but one cannot be certain owing to our ignorance of the details contained in other accounts to which Lucan had access, most importantly Livy and Asinius Pollio. With that caveat in mind, a number of moments in *BC* 7 appear to respond directly to Caesar's account. Pompey's speech to his troops at 85–127 echoes details from his speech at *Caes. Civ.* 3.86.2–5; in particular his insistence upon victory *uulnere nullo* (92) and his near completion of the war (101), as well as his acknowledgment of the inexperience of his own troops (102). By contrast, Caesar's speech at 250–329 and Pompey's second speech at 337–84 have little correlation to their counterparts in Caesar. Lucan's searing curse upon Crastinus (470–5n.) makes sense as a direct response to the high praise for courage and loyalty with which he is uniquely honoured in Caesar (even if the detail of his casting the first javelin is Livian, see 472n.). Lucan's account of the death of Domitius has been read as a travesty of Caesar's version,<sup>36</sup> and Lucan's Caesar appears even to hint at the version of events found in the historical Caesar's account (606–7n.). Caesar's command to take Pompey's camp and the description of the camp itself correspond in a number of details to Caesar's version of events (cf. esp. 732–4, 736–7, 740–2 and 761nn.).

*Livy*

Livy was an important source of historical information for Lucan, although the full nature and extent of Lucan's use of his work is obscured by the

<sup>34</sup> For a comparison of *Caes. Civ.* and *BC* see Bachofen 1972: 1–45 (tables for the whole poem), 151–66 (*BC* 7). Radicke 2004: 29–30 n. 3 rejects the idea of *BC* responding to *Caes. Civ.* Other scholars assume a relationship: e.g. Ahl 1976: 307 'a counterpoise'; Henderson 1987: 132–3 (see next note), 158 n. 57; Masters 1992: index s.v. 'Caesar as Lucan's model' ('a deformation . . . an act of defiance', 25) and 1994.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Henderson 1987: 132–3 'It is essential to Lucan's project that *his* War in Words should be compared and contrasted with the successful *Latinitas*, the powerful facility and felicity, of the *Commentarii* and *Corpus Caesarianum* as monuments to narration-as-success' (original emphasis).

<sup>36</sup> Masters 1994: esp. 167–8.

fact that the historian's account of the civil war in books 109–112 survives in only summary or fragmentary form.<sup>37</sup> We know that in Livy's treatment of Pharsalus in book 111, Crastinus is recorded as casting the first javelin of the battle (*Comm. Bern.* on 7.470, *ASL* on 7.471; cf. 472n.), a detail missing from Caesar's account at *Civ.* 3.91.4. Plutarch (*Caes.* 47) also cites Livy as the source of the augury of Gaius Cornelius and notes that he was a friend of the historian (cf. 185–213n.). Although we lack explicit confirmation for further episodes, Livy is the most probable source for at least some of the details of Pompey's dream (cf. 7–44n.) and is likely also to have recorded omens of defeat such as Lucan does at 151–7 (see notes *ad loc.*).

Livy's history more generally offered Lucan a number of important models and paradigms that he adapts to the characters and themes of his poem. Elements of Hannibal's speech before Ticinus are reused by Caesar in his pre-battle exhortation at 250–329: a rhetorical choice that further assists and develops the association of the two men in the poem (cf. 250–329, 285–9, 290–2nn.).<sup>38</sup> So too, Livy's account of the aftermath of Cannae at 22.51.5–9 is an important precursor to Caesar's inspection of the post-battle carnage at 786–824, especially when the reader is directed to Hannibal's burial of Aemilius Paullus as a point of comparison for Caesar's denial of burial to the dead at 799–801. With respect to Lucan's Pompey, Livy offered the paradigm of the experienced general compelled by subordinates to action before its proper time (Liv. 6.23.4, 7.12.9–15.8; see 45–61, 647–97nn.); Pompey's view of his defeat at 649–51 emulates the premier example of this model in Camillus at Satricum in 381 BCE. The sequel to this Livian pattern, in which the general rallies his troops for an eleventh-hour victory, offers some context for considering Pompey's decision to flee battle.

Livy was also evidently a significant influence upon Lucan's language and expression. Much of the language in book 7 that evokes historiography can be paralleled in Livy (e.g. 57, 107–8, 733nn.) and many an evocative phrase (240, 332, 564nn.), neat formulation (345n.), arresting image (350–1n., 539, 790–1n.) or motif (532–3, 787nn.) finds its antecedent in Livy's prose.

### *Virgil*

Virgil is the single most important influence upon Lucan's epic.<sup>39</sup> His works, especially the *Aeneid*, are a pervasive point of reference in book 7

<sup>37</sup> Pichon 1912; Radicke 2004: 9–43; discussion in Roche 2009.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. e.g. 1.303–5 with Roche. Ahl 1976: 107–11.

<sup>39</sup> Narducci 1979 and 2002: esp. 75–87; Horsfall 1995: 268–72; Tarrant 1997: 65–7; von Albrecht 1999: 236–43; Casali 2011: 81–111; Hardie 2013: 227–9.

as elsewhere in *BC*. At the largest scale of response, Lucan's poem answers the ideology it implicitly attributes to the *Aeneid* by replacing Virgil's narrative of foundation and *pietas* with one of impious self-destruction.<sup>40</sup> The much-delayed confrontation between epic protagonists on the battlefield naturally evokes *Iliad* 22 and *Aeneid* 12 – a point of comparison which casts Pompey in the role of Hector and Turnus and has Caesar emulate Achilles and Aeneas – but throughout *BC* 7 the *Aeneid* is much more frequently the object of allusion than the *Iliad*.<sup>41</sup> Homeric epic is important both for the horizon of expectations it creates regarding epic battle and for generic norms more generally, but direct references to *Iliad* 22 are few. Pompey is patterned on Hector at the moment of his realization that the gods have abandoned him (85–6n.), and the motif of the scales of fate originates in *Iliad* 22 (504–5n.), but it is important to note that both of these Iliadic moments have counterparts in Virgil's *Aeneid*.

Lucan's use of Virgil is often significant for the themes of his poem or the characterization of his heroes. The reader's consideration of the Virgilian context of an allusion invariably redounds to the discredit of Lucan's characters, who are either exposed as inadequate by comparison with their model, or shown to be lesser, often ersatz, versions of their Virgilian counterparts; or they are incriminated by comparison with impious characters of the *Aeneid*, or marked as doomed by comparison with its losers. Thus Pompey frequently evokes Virgil's Turnus: in the moment he realizes the gods have turned from his cause (85–6n.), as he resolves to cease deferring the summative encounter (87–8n.) or when he exhorts his troops to be mindful of their families (347n.). Pompey's words and actions can recall aged kings in crisis from the *Aeneid*. When Pompey capitulates to the demands of his camp at 85–127, he makes a number of allusions to the speech made by Latinus in which the king yields to the throng of Latins baying for war (A. 7.594–600). In the same way, at 87–8 Pompey's rhetoric ironically recalls Virgil's Priam futilely arming for Troy's defence (A. 2.521–3). The influence of these passages upon the reader of Lucan may serve both to reinforce Pompey's forfeiture of authority and to suggest his status within *BC* as an ineffectual old man, mismatched against the greater vigour of a younger opponent.<sup>42</sup> The Pompeians preparing their weapons for battle (139–43) are modelled upon Virgil's Italians readying their armour for war against the Trojans (A. 7.626–40). Conversely, when they realize that the critical day which

<sup>40</sup> Feeney 2011: 135 neatly summarizes the issue: 'Lucan is determined to show that Virgil was wrong to think that a beneficent world order emerged from the destruction of the republic.'

<sup>41</sup> One exception is Hom. *Il.* 16.818–61 (echoed at Virg. A. 10.739–46): the model for the exchange of speeches at Domitius' death.

<sup>42</sup> For Pompey's age in *BC* see 1.129–30 with Roche.

will decide human affairs forever is upon them (131–2), Lucan ironically alludes to the rumour among Virgil's Trojans that the day had arrived on which they could found their promised city (A. 7.145).

Caesar too recalls Virgil's Turnus: in his battle rhetoric (251, 308–9), in his capacity to inspire audacity in his soldiers (246) and in his battle rage (569–71). Further Virgilian models offer context for Caesar in battle: the gods of war at Actium (568n.) and *furor* furnishing weapons amid civil strife (574n.). Caesar's impatience and desire for power can be cast in terms that ironically recall the anxiety of Aeneas (240). His exchange with the dying Domitius puts him in an aggressor's role played by Homer's Hector and Virgil's Mezentius (597–616n.). When Caesar is described as wading through the vital organs of his fatherland (*patriae per uiscera*), the detail reminds Lucan's readers of the precise terms of Anchises' warning to the unborn Caesar and Pompey in Virgil's Underworld not to unleash civil war on Rome (*patriae . . . in uiscera*, see 721–2n.). The simile that likens the torment of Caesar's dreams at 777–80 to the madness of Orestes, Pentheus and Agave is modelled on the simile at A. 4.469–73 comparing the mental state of Dido as she dreams of Aeneas to that of Pentheus and Orestes.

Minor characters are also contextualized by Virgilian allusion. The narrator apostrophizes Brutus with an honorific form of address borrowed from Virgil's Hector (58). Domitius' death at 599–616 is modelled on that of Homer's Patroclus and Virgil's Orodes and his dying moment is made to evoke that of the major figures Camilla and Turnus (616n.). Lucan's apostrophe to the *summi homines* at 205–13 reworks Virgil's apostrophe to Nisus and Euryalus at A. 9.446–9 (185–213n.), but instead of claiming to immortalize minor figures by the power of his song, Lucan holds out to major characters the prospect of a fame that he admits they may achieve independently of his poem.

The horror of the imminent battle is repeatedly evoked by allusion to the Sibyl's vision of war in Italy at A. 6.83–97 (116, 292) and Aeneas' prediction of carnage at A. 8.537–40 (114–16). Descriptions of the significance or consequences of Pharsalus frequently direct the reader to the *Aeneid*. The narrator calls the battle *tot rerum finem*, an answer to Jupiter's promise in the *Aeneid* of an *imperium sine fine* (137n.). Cornelius models his augury of the battle upon Virgil's Panthus proclaiming the end of Troy (195n.). The desolation of Italian towns predicted at 391–6 as a result of the civil war responds to Anchises' prediction of future fame for the Alban colonies at A. 6.773–6. The narrator's incredulous questioning of Jupiter's willingness to let Pharsalus take place recalls Iarbas' prayer to Jupiter at A. 4.206–18. The battle cry at 475–84 which re-echoes around the topography of Thessaly is modelled upon the shepherd's call sounded out by Allecto and re-echoed by the topography of central Italy



at A. 7.511–18. The most significant passages in the *Georgics* for BC 7 are G. 4.170–5, which offers context for the Pompeians arming for battle at 139–43; and above all G. 1.489–97: the model for Lucan's apostrophe to Thessaly (847–72) and influential at various other points in the book (116, 538, 592n., 846).

### *Seneca the Younger*

Book 7 gives ample evidence for the aesthetic principles (hyperbole, paradox) and thematic preoccupations (e.g. evil, tyranny, the inversion of family relations) that Lucan's epic has in common with his uncle's tragedies.<sup>43</sup> It is often impossible to isolate Seneca's presence in Lucan independently of Virgil's (and Ovid's) influence upon Seneca – frequently a striking phrase, formula or image is paralleled in both (e.g. 186–7 *praesaga malorum* | . . . *mens*, 294 *in caede natantes*, 348 *medio posuit deus omnia campo*) – but this should not obscure for us the impact of the tragedies upon Lucan's language. This influence can be felt from the opening lines of book 7 in the sun's reluctance to shine on the scene of surpassing evil (1–6n.). Paradoxical and hyperbolic expressions relating to evil often point to Seneca's influence: *nefas* surpassing *malum* (122–3), for example, or the notion of criminality itself as something precious that must not be wasted (558). Lucan's descriptions of psychological distress (183–4, 779), prophetic possession (185–6) and portents (475–6) often draw on similar scenes in the tragedies. Jupiter shrouding Thyestes in darkness at 451–2 may well direct readers to Seneca's version of the play, and these lines appear to correct details in it (see 451–2n.). If 769 *inspirasse animas* refers to souls rather than air being breathed into the sleeping Caesarians, Lucan may have drawn on Seneca's striking comparison of Tantalus' soul as a harmful vapor for this image (see 768–9n.). The opening of Sen. *Ag.* may furnish some details for Caesar's battlefield breakfast (793n.), and Sen. *Oed.* may inform the description of avian migration from Thrace to Egypt 834–5. Seneca's influence upon Lucan's language can be seen in a number of evocative collocations (26); images and ideas more broadly evocative of tragedy, for example the idea of family (and especially children) as the only consolation for those afflicted with evil (180–1); and a number of striking expressions: e.g. *preces perire* (211), *matura in fata ruentes* (668), *funesta pabula* (825).

Lucan's description of the natural world is not uncommonly paralleled in Senecan prose. The 'pillars of fire' seen by the Pompeians at 155 and the effects of lightning upon their scabbards at 158–9 both seem to be drawn from the *Natural Questions*. Senecan prose works occasionally

<sup>43</sup> Thompson 1956; Narducci 2002: 51–74.

offer larger frameworks, such as the ‘either/or’ framing of impassive or engaged divine spectatorship (447–8n.), and can provide close parallels for philosophical language: the equanimity with which Domitius dies, for example (612–13n.). As is the case for Seneca’s tragedies, Virgil’s influence upon the language of Senecan prose means that it is often impossible to draw an exclusive line between a striking phrase in Lucan and his uncle’s prose works independently of the *Aeneid*: cf. expressions such as *tela Iouis praesaga* (197) or *sanguineum . . . quatiens Bellona flagellum* (568). Nevertheless, the influence of Senecan prose on *BC* suggests itself in many aspects of Lucan’s language: in closely paralleled metonymies, such as *mors* for the means of death (517) or *cursus* as the ‘course of fate’ (544); in evocative metaphors, such as *lacero* used of countries, nations or people (665), or Pompey ‘putting off the burden of destiny’ (686–7); in emotive pairings such as *Romanus . . . cruor* (50–11) and in neat, sententious formulations, such as *caelo tegitur qui non habet urnam* (819).

## 7 VIEWING, SEEING, SPECTATORSHIP

Pharsalus is the central extravaganza in a poem committed to spectacle, invested in audience reaction and full of performed deaths, horrifying visions and disturbing images. Even against this backdrop *BC* 7 is remarkable for the thematic attention it pays to vivid spectacles and the gaze of its protagonists, and for its narrator’s sustained attempt to bring the absent images of his narrative vividly to life before his audience’s eyes.<sup>44</sup> This vividness, called *ἐνάργεια* by rhetoricians (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.29 and 32, quoted at 9–10n.), was thought to evoke the emotions of one’s audience just as if they were present at the event itself (Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.32 *affectus non aliter quam si rebus ipsis intersimus sequentur*): a claim that should be compared with the narrator’s statements regarding the ability of his poem to arouse the passions of its future readers at 210–13.

Events in the book are often narrated in a manner that draws attention to the faculty of sight: in a vivid dream Pompey ‘sees’ the audience of his own spectacular triumph (9–12) before the narrator expounds further upon the appearance (*facies*) of the favouring people (13–19). The dread of Pompey’s soldiers is compared to the fear felt by a spectator of universal cataclysm (134–7). Before battle Caesar draws his soldiers’ attention to his own evaluative gaze (290–2), exhorts them to battle with visions of bloodied rivers (292–4), assures them he has never seen the gods so near (297–8) and ensures their commitment by bidding them to ‘see’ the

<sup>44</sup> On *ἐνάργεια* in ancient theory and practice: Zanker 1981; Webb 2009: 87–130. On *ἐνάργεια*, viewing and spectatorship in Lucan see Leigh 1997a and Lovatt 2013: 111–20.

chains and crosses awaiting them if they lose (304). Pompey too conjures vivid images for his soldiers: mothers imploring them from city walls, aged senators grovelling, *Roma* herself running to meet them, peoples present and future bringing them their prayers (369–76).

Mid-battle, the narrator renounces the gods in favour of sheer chance if Jupiter can be an impassive spectator of the slaughter (445–8). Caesar on the other hand closely inspects the weapons of his troops for evidence of their commitment (560–5), while the gaze of fellow soldiers is said to elicit from the Caesarians an excessive wrath: perverse proof that they are not committing parricide (629–30). Pompey views defeat from the hill (649–53)<sup>45</sup> and flees battle wishing not to see the *nefas* through to the end (698–9 *nonne iuuat . . . | perspectasse nefas*) but to remove his death from Caesar's gaze, only to be assured that whenever Caesar wishes to look upon his head it will be presented to him (673–5). His dignity in flight is expressed by the unshakable expression he wears as he gazes upon Emathia (682–3), at the same time his success and adversity alike are described as viewing him (683–4).

Book 7 less frequently adopts the imagery of gladiatorial spectacles so frequent elsewhere in the poem,<sup>46</sup> but it is reserved for a key moment: as Pompey leaves the field and the senate fights on for its own cause, the battle now consists of 'the pair of adversaries that we always have, Liberty and Caesar' (695–6 *par quod semper habemus, | Libertas et Caesar*): the first person plural *habemus* suggesting the viewing audience of an unending bout between freedom and the principate.

The theme of spectatorship reaches its gory apogee in Caesar's joyful contemplation of the post-battle carnage (786–824): Caesar 'sees his fortune and gods' in the carnage (796), and refuses the dead burial so as not to lose the joyful spectacle of his crimes (797), a vivid evocation of the conceptual associations of unnatural appetites, cruelty and the tyrannical gaze.<sup>47</sup>

## 8 STATES OF MIND: MADNESS, HOPE, FEAR, ANGER, JOY

For the Stoics, the emotions (τὰ πάθη) felt by the majority of humanity were false beliefs and therefore wrong by definition.<sup>48</sup> The four main categories of Stoic emotion – desire, fear, pain and pleasure – were thought to

<sup>45</sup> Leigh 1997a: 110–57.

<sup>46</sup> On gladiatorial imagery in Lucan see Ahl 1976: 82–112, esp. 86–8; Masters 1992: 35, 44, 109–10; Leigh 1997a: 234–6.

<sup>47</sup> See Leigh 1997b.

<sup>48</sup> See Inwood 1985: esp. 127–81; Brennan 2003: 269–74; cf. Konstan 2015 (on the emotions in Seneca).

arise from the attribution of goodness or badness without knowledge to future and present states; all other emotions were conceived as subcategories of these four. The Stoic sage was thought not to have these emotions but rather εὐπράθεις (lit. 'good emotions'): the attribution of goodness or badness based on knowledge (e.g. that vice is bad or virtue is good). By contrast *BC* (and book 7 especially) is remarkable for the intensity of its emotional landscape and for its depictions of madness. His subject matter offered Lucan the perfect vehicle for dwelling on and illustrating the destructive effect of unrestrained passions.

*BC* is pervaded by madness; the civil war it narrates is repeatedly described as insanity (cf. e.g. 1.8 *quis furor, o ciues, quae tanta licentia ferri?*) and book 7 describes the culmination of this fury.<sup>49</sup> The epicentre of this theme in *BC* might fairly be claimed for the centre of the battle (551–7), where heavy emphasis is laid upon the madness that Caesar possesses, embodies and inspires in others (cf. esp. 551 *hic furor, hic rabies, hic sunt tua crimina, Caesar* and 557 *Caesar, rabies populis stimulusque furorum*). This attribution of insanity to Caesar is typical of *BC* as a whole and it permeates book 7 (with the momentary exception of 245, where his *rabies* wanes as he sees the longed-for battle at last on offer). Caesar attributes frenzy to his own soldiers (295) and they are assimilated to his fury:<sup>50</sup> Crastinus' casting of the battle's first weapon is a *praeceps rabies* (474), their own re-echoing war cry (*uoces furoris*) terrifies them (483–4); his army is a *uesanum agmen* (496). Caesar's demonic fury in battle has its sequel in the frenzied post-battle dreams which haunt all of the Caesarians but Caesar especially (760–86, cf. esp. 776 *omnes in Caesare manes*); in this arena too Caesar surpasses all rivals and measures up to mythological paradigms of guilt-ridden madness (777–80). On the following morning Caesar, *furens*, does not want to lose the joyful spectacle of the unburied dead (797).

Both Pompey and Caesar are described as *furens* at 1.115 but thereafter the term is not applied to Pompey. In *BC* 7 Pompey is not only set in contrast to the madness of Caesar but opposed to the self-destructive madness of his own forces (45–61n.): cf. esp. 95 (Pompey to his soldiers) '*quis furor, o caeci, scelorum?*' (an echo of the narrator at 1.8). The *dira* . . . *rabies* (51) that sweeps away both the sound reasoning of Pompey's strategy and his resolve to restrain his army is repeatedly attributed to the Pompeians before battle: they are frenzied with rage (124), *dementes* (180), they think their own madness is an omen of their crimes (184), they tremble with frenzied fear (186 *lymphato* . . . *metu*).

<sup>49</sup> Hershkovitz 1998: 197–246.

<sup>50</sup> See Leigh 1997a: 191–233 and Fucecchi 2011: 248–50 on Caesar's subordinates.

The narrator's claim at 211 that his poem will arouse hope, fear and prayers in his future readers is consistent with the prominent place accorded to the emotions in *BC* 7. In a book of epic devoted to battle it might be assumed that the dominant emotion would be (Iliadic) wrath, but *BC* 7 is actually dominated by the fear that is monopolized by the Pompeians from its beginning.<sup>51</sup> Fear features prominently in the rhetorical exchanges between Pompey and his camp: they call him 'slow and timid' (*segnis pauidusque*, 52) and more insidiously suggest that he is afraid of peace (55); Cicero is incredulous that Pompey should have fear concerning the gods' support for the senate's cause (76–7). In return Pompey tells his camp that they are afraid of conquering without bloodshed (95–6) and that his whole strategy has been so that inexperienced soldiers need not fear battle (101–2); he tries to manage their precipitate desire for battle with an apothegm lauding the ability to defer frightening experiences (105–7). The fear felt for their leader by the Pompeians prior to battle is stressed at 133–8. The narrator later doubts whether the prodigies witnessed by Pompey's forces at 151–84 were real or merely believed through their excessive fear (172–3; cf. 185–6). Pompey feels an ominous dread as he sees Caesar's squadrons march out, which he suppresses to exhort his soldiers (340–1); in response, they resolve to die in case the fears he has outlined in his speech are genuine (384 *si uera timeret*). By contrast, even in Caesar's moment of hesitation prior to the battle, fear is ruled out at 247–8: his destiny does not allow it.

As the opposing lines charge, fear of tyranny motivates the Pompeians (386) but the fear repeatedly ascribed to them during the battle is less ideological in nature: they are so crushed together they fear their own swords (495), Pompey's barbarian cavalry has no shame of its fear (525) and after it is routed panic spreads to everyone: a decisive factor for Caesar (543–5). During the battle, the only fear attributed to Caesar is a prospective strategic concern which allows him to anticipate Pompey's battle-plan (521–2). For the narrator the battle against Caesar at Pharsalus was waged *pauide* and the principate is a punishment being paid by subsequent generations for another's fear (643–5).

Pompey flees Pharsalus partly motivated by the misplaced fear that if he were to die in battle the whole world would die with him (671–2). As he rides away the fact that he does not fear weapons from behind contributes to the ostensible picture of courage and dignity (678). The final moments of the battle narrative are marked by panic: Caesar presses on to Pompey's camp in case night dispels the *pauor* afflicting the Pompeians and he resolves to act while *terror* is accomplishing everything (732–4).

<sup>51</sup> Words denoting fear occur more frequently (relative to the poem's total number of lines) in *BC* than in Virg. *A.* or Ov. *Met.*: Mackay 1961: 308.

The final attribution of the emotion in the book comes during the night following the battle, when each Caesarian is accosted by his own image of *terror* (773).

Hope typically characterizes Caesar in *BC* 7, as elsewhere in the poem.<sup>52</sup> Pompey's fate is only a momentary impediment to Caesar's hope at 247–8, which is prominent in Caesar's speeches to his troops:<sup>53</sup> hope for this day was what motivated their crossing of the Rubicon (255), his soldiers' ambitions are styled a hope for the world (*spem mundi*, 270) and he trembles with hope at the prospect of the imminent battle (297). At the outset of battle hope of tyranny stirs the onrushing Caesarians (set in contrast to the fear of the Pompeians, 386), at the battle's conclusion, plundering Pompey's camp is made relative for the Caesarians by their hope of plundering Rome (759). On the other hand, when the Pompeians feel hope it is evidence either of madness, as when they hope for father's throats, and brother's breasts (180–4); or of delusion, as when Pompey claims that the better moral cause compels hope for favouring gods (349) or when Domitius dies hoping that Caesar will be defeated (615). When Pompey flees battle, his hope vanishes, never again to be fulfilled (688). The narrator looks beyond the scope of his epic when he addresses Brutus as the supreme hope of the senate (588), an allusion to Caesar's assassination.

The morality of anger in epic is highly contextual and often determined by character.<sup>54</sup> Anger could be a positive aid or even a requirement for epic battle and be closely connected to a hero's pursuit of *uirtus*; and yet it might easily exceed human control and become transgressive. When *ira* is noted in *BC* 7 it can describe the positive 'fire of wrath' (as Pompey calls it at 101–4) appropriate for epic battle; thus as both sides charge to battle they are spurred by differing stimuli to anger (385–6). When Pompey capitulates to a camp afflicted by madness, the description of his soldiers as raging with anger (124 *furentibus ira*) seems to point to more than this normative anger. The Caesarians clearly pervert normal epic anger when they 'disprove' parricide in battle by the excessive *ira* shown to their enemies (629). Also plainly transgressive is the wrath of Caesar which has not yet been sated on the following morning, and motivates his inhuman treatment of the dead (802, 809).

Moments of happiness and states of joy in *BC* 7 offset the imminent horror of battle or provide a recourse in defeat. Pompey, backward looking from the start of the poem,<sup>55</sup> returns mentally to happier times both

<sup>52</sup> Cf. 1.146–7 *quo spes quoque ira uocasset | ferre manum*.

<sup>53</sup> Hope was a common motivation in pre-battle rhetoric: see e.g. Harrison on Virg. *A.* 10.263.

<sup>54</sup> Thornton 1976: 159–63; Galinsky 1988: 333; Braund and Gilbert 2003; Tarrant on Virg. *A.* 12.108 *se suscitāt ira*.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. e.g. 1.134–5 *multumque priori | credere fortunae*.

in his pre-battle dream (7, 21, 28) and at the moment of his flight from battle (685–8). In battle Domitius falls joyfully into a thousand wounds, happy not to have a second pardon from Caesar (603–4). Happiness can also indicate a deranged mind or illustrate shocking inversions of normal ethics: Pompeians rejoice in their fearful prodigies (183); Caesar is delighted not to see the Emathian fields, hidden by slaughter, and does not want to lose the joyful spectacle of the unburied dead (794–7).

## 9 PARADOX AND HYPERBOLE

In Lucan's conception the civil war was itself a paradox.<sup>56</sup> This rhetorical figure is a continuous presence in *BC* and one of the most characteristic elements of Lucan's language. The narrator and every character in the poem have frequent recourse to expressions founded upon or pointing to incompatible elements, and these often compel their audience to contemplate and resolve their apparent contradictions. Paradox is a means of sharpening expression, arresting attention and eliciting the intellectual engagement of one's audience. In *BC* it can be a momentary phenomenon, expressed in a phrase and affecting only its very immediate context: a *uaticinata quies* (22), for example, or fields 'swimming' (728). It can also have larger implications. It may bring out character traits, such as the pacifist Cicero 'enraged by the war' (65), or the dilatory Pompey being 'forced to conquer' (78), or the transgressive Caesar remembering his enemies are fellow citizens and so *continuing* in his inhumane treatment of them (802–3). The figure often leaves the reader with lasting and vivid impressions such as the image of one side 'waging' and the other 'suffering' civil war (501–2) or of battles 'waged by throats' (533). Paradox often illustrates the inverted ethical framework of fighting in a civil war, as it does when Pompeians 'rejoice' in the spectre of family members harmed (183). It can abbreviate larger concepts and phenomena, such as victory's ability to transform criminality into legitimate power (cf. 1.2 *iusque datum sceleri*): we see this when Caesar tells his soldiers to 'absolve their guilt with the sword' (262). It can encapsulate neatly the permanent aftermath of the war, in ruined cities as imperishable monuments (397–8) or in the city of Rome as being able to contain the whole world's population (400–1) and yet being 'filled up' with dregs (405). Paradox can articulate the realities of living under autocracy, such as the groans that conceal grief at Caesar's triumph (43; note however that the text

<sup>56</sup> On paradox and hyperbole in Lucan: see Bonner 1966: esp. 263, 281–9 on Lucan's rhetorical education and these figures; Martindale 1976: 45–8, esp. 46–7 on the paradoxical nature of the civil war; Hardie 2013: 237–8 ('an orgy of extravagance and excess', 237). Henderson 1987: 135–51 is illuminating on a wide range of Lucan's linguistic strategies.



here is uncertain). Paradox can elaborate the very largest concerns of Lucan's poem and articulate a whole mode of conceiving of the war, as when we are told that Pompey should pity Caesar for winning the battle (701) because to win was worse (706). It might speak directly to the situation of Lucan's Neronian audience, such as when the narrator contrasts a generation wishing to be born free (the next generation of Lucan's contemporaries) with one wishing to die free (the combatants at Pharsalus, 375–6) or in his claims that Rome will have her revenge on the gods for the war by making her own divinities equal to the gods (457).

Hyperbole is also a basic component of Lucan's style and an important strategy in his attempt to describe a subject matter that beggars description.<sup>57</sup> It has been said that *BC* possesses a 'rhetoric of hyperbole which insists on its inadequacy to meaning';<sup>58</sup> a neat summation of the poem's drive to make often absurdly exaggerated claims in order to capture the full reality, scale, consequence, horror or enormity of the poem's subject matter. Hyperbole in *BC* is intimately related to (i) the all-encompassing geography of a civil war fought throughout a world-empire, (ii) the permanent consequences of Caesar's victory at Rome (i.e. the principate) and (iii) the surpassing nature of the crime of civil war as presented by Lucan. Thus Pompey's forces are frequently described as the whole world (e.g. 69–70, 278, 363–4) and the impact of the battle is described as affecting the whole human race (399–400). Similarly, it is said that the unique significance of Pharsalus among battles was its capacity to destroy not individual people but whole nations (632–5) and that after Pharsalus civil war battles will spread throughout the entire world (870).

The frequency and some of the effect of hyperbole in *BC* – as well as the broader 'totalizing' style of the poem – can conveniently be seen by attention to the adjectives *omnis* and *totus*. Thus (selectively), the entire *aether* obstructs the Pompeians as they advance to battle (153) and supernatural signs of Pharsalus occur throughout the entire world (204). During the republic every war gave nations to Rome and every year saw Rome expand to the ends of the earth (421–2): everything the planets saw was Roman (425); by contrast the one day of Pharsalus is a match for all the years of republican success (426–7). In the battle, every sword grows warm with blood on Caesar's side (503); Pharsalus will cast Romans down into slavery for all time (640 *in totum mundi . . . aevum*) and every age that will be enslaved was conquered there (641). After the battle the entire *aer* is infected with ghosts (769–70) and every haunting shade is in Caesar (776); every grove sends forth birds to plunder the dead and every tree drips with gore upon their return (836–7). Even if every ancestral grave

<sup>57</sup> Martindale 1976; cf. Henderson 1987: 131.

<sup>58</sup> Henderson 1987: 123.



were to be emptied the dead could not equal the casualties at Pharsalus (855), after which civil war battles burden the entire world with crime (870).

Epic before Lucan (and poetry more generally) had a large repertoire of exaggerated expressions and a number of Lucan's hyperboles revisit these, albeit in often extreme or idiosyncratic versions.<sup>59</sup> Thus shouts reaching the sky (477–8), weapons in flight creating night over the battlefield (519–20) or blood driving a weapon out of a victim's body (621–2) are all recognizable as poetic (and especially epic) modes of description. Other examples clearly attempt to surpass epic norms. Epic descriptions of the blood spilt in battle often extend to hyperbole, but in *BC* this is pushed to its limits: for example, such great torrents of Roman blood flow over the battlefield that the gore cannot congeal (636–7) and the blood soaking the plains at Pharsalus will not have dried by the time the Battle of Philippi is fought six years later (853–4). Similarly, heaps of dead (*acerui*) are a common detail in epic and other genres,<sup>60</sup> but in book 7 we are told of mounds of dead bodies as high as hills (790–1) and of piles of corpses so widespread that they entirely conceal the plain from sight (794–5).

Hyperbole in Lucan is often used as a means of characterization. It conveys Caesar's enormity: his pre-battle rhetoric can conceive of a world defeated with the first movement of the sword (278); he sees nations swimming in blood (294) and crucifixion awaiting his side if they should lose (304). Trenches and ramparts could not prevent the Caesarians from the rewards of their crimes (749–50). Even Pompey is momentarily imagined as possessing gigantic proportions such that the world could collapse over his body (671–2); his 'wanderings' in the Aegean Sea in book 8 may be described as taking place in unknown regions of the world (703n.). Hyperbole also frequently serves a larger grotesque aesthetic felt throughout the poem. For example, blood and gore 'stream' down from the sky to land on Caesarian faces (839) and even limbs are dropped by exhausted carrion birds in flight (840), while future crops at Pharsalus will rise discoloured by the blood that fertilizes them (851).

## 10 APOSTROPHE

The voice of Lucan's narrator is a constant, obtrusive presence in his poem.<sup>61</sup> One of the most immediately recognizable aspects of this presence is his tendency to apostrophize a wide range of figures (including

<sup>59</sup> On hyperbole see Hardie 1986: 241–92; *VE* s.v. 'Hyperbole'.

<sup>60</sup> See e.g. Harrison on Virg. *A.* 10.245.

<sup>61</sup> Syndikus 1958: 39–43; Seitz 1965: 216–32; Henderson 1987; Masters 1992; Narducci 2002: 88–106; McRoberts 2005; D'Alessandro Behr 2007.

characters, collective groups, animals, personified battles, landscapes and deities). One study counts 155 examples of the narrator making such apostrophes in *BC*:<sup>62</sup> a figure greater than the combined total for Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.<sup>63</sup> Book 7 contains more examples than any other book of the poem: no fewer than thirty, a third more than the next most populated book. This density of the narrator's explicit presence is a reflection of the heightened emotional register of the book and its critical importance as a turning point in events which the narrator wishes had never come to pass.

Apostrophe is frequently a vehicle of pathos: the narrator 'tells' Pompey that he will never again see his *patriae sedes* (23), or addresses the people of Rome who will never openly mourn Pompey's death (43–4), or assures Pompey that he cannot hide his death from Caesar (674), or turns to Cornelia to say that she motivated Pompey's flight (675–7). It may enhance various conceits, such as that Pharsalus itself may eventually be sated by the blood spilt there (536–7). It may express the narrator's desire for an alternative outcome to the events he narrates, or 'perform' the narrator's attempt to subvert the historical outcome of his narrative, as when he asks the *castrorum uigiles* not to awaken Pompey on the morning of Pharsalus (24–5), or momentarily prays that civil war battles will be limited to Pharsalus and that she alone remain an object of Roman hatred (869). Apostrophe often sharpens for the reader a sense of the vitriol felt by the narrator towards Caesar: he is asked to which underworld deities he prayed prior to battle (168–71), or is 'told' that his madness and crimes cluster in the centre of battle (551), or that he wades through a pile of slaughter and the guts of his fatherland (721–3). A dense cluster of apostrophes to Pompey describe to him the manner in which he flees battle (680–2, 698–711) and may be read as either dignifying or making ironic his withdrawal from the plain. Lucan addresses the *summi homines* of his poem and Pompey at 205–13 to predict the emotional power of his narrative over future generations of readers and their partisan support of Pompey, and at 552 he addresses his own mind when he refuses to narrate the events at the centre of battle. Apostrophe can function as a clausal device in *BC*: lines 847–72 – effectively an epilogue addressed to Thessaly and dwelling upon the issue of her guilt – mark the end of our book in a similar fashion to the apostrophes that conclude books 4 and 8.

<sup>62</sup> McRoberts 2005: 219–34; his definitions are set out at 234–8. One might refine his figures very slightly: he does not e.g. include the narrator's apostrophe to the people of Rome at 43–4. D'Alessandro Behr 2007 is a wide-ranging study of the figure in *BC*.

<sup>63</sup> McRoberts counts thirty examples in all of the *Iliad*, fifteen in the *Odyssey*, sixteen in the *Argonautica*, fifty-four in the *Aeneid* and ninety-nine in the *Metamorphoses*.

## 11 SENTENTIAE

Lucan's frequent use of *sententiae* is another important characteristic of his style.<sup>64</sup> The term *sententia* originally described a concise generalization on human life (called a gnomic *sententia*); these could be removed from their original contexts and stand alone as moral advice or social observation (Arist. *Rhet.* 2.21 (1394a); *Rhet. Her.* 4.17.24). Under the influence of declamatory rhetoric, the term was extended to cover a general reflection adapted to a specific individual or an incisive comment applied to meet particular circumstances (Quint. *Inst.* 8.5.6, 8.5.15). Both generalized (gnomic) and specific *sententiae* are frequent in *BC* 7 (as in every book of *BC*). For examples of generalized *sententiae* cf. 454–5 *mortalia nulli | sunt curata deo*, or (in quick succession) 818 *libera Fortunae mors est*, 818–19 *capit omnia tellus | quae genuit*, 819 *caelo tegitur qui non habet urnam*. In declamation and in Lucan *sententiae* frequently depend on surprise (e.g. 61 *in Pompeianis uotum est Pharsalia castris*); they are sharpened by antithesis (e.g. 109 *pugnare* *ducem quam uincere* *malunt*, 375–6 *haec libera nasci*, | *haec uult turba mori*, 386 *metus hos regni*, *spes excitat illos*, 645–6 *post proelia natis | si dominum*, *Fortuna*, *dabas*, *et bella dedisses*). They are often paradoxical (501–2 *ciuilia bella | una acies patitur*, *gerit altera*, 706 *uincere peius erat*, 526–7 *fecere palam ciuilia bella | non bene barbaricis umquam commissa cateruis*, 727 *felix se nescit amari*). They are regularly used as a clausal device at the end of a speech, section or a larger sequence of thought ('terminal *sententiae*'): cf. 138 *urbi Magnoque timetur*, 368 *Caesar nostris non sufficit armis*.

## 12 DICTION, WORD ORDER, METRE

Compared to Virgil, Lucan favours a more restricted range of less poetic words, and he is less concerned to vary usage or avoid repetition than his predecessors.<sup>65</sup> *BC* 7 contains a number of well-known examples that illustrate this tendency.<sup>66</sup> *cadauer* (× 7 in *BC* 7; once only in Virg. *A.* and *Ov. Met.*) is favoured and often deployed for shock-value, as at 598 *patricium . . . cadauer*, or used of close relatives at 627 and 775. *mors*, *mortalis*, *moriore* (× 24 in *BC* 7) is much more commonly found than the poetic *letum* (× 2; *letifer* once). *pilum* (× 4 in *BC* 7; × 19 in *BC*), the more prosaic term, is preferred to *iaculum* (× 1 in *BC* 7; × 10 in *BC*). The everyday term *gladius* and

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90 (on Lucan) *sententiis clarissimus*; see Bonner 1966: 260–9.

<sup>65</sup> For the notion of poetic and unpoetic terms see Axelson 1945; Williams 1968: 743–50; Watson 1985.

<sup>66</sup> I offer some representative examples; for further comments on Lucan's distinctive vocabulary see Mayer 1981: 12–14; Bramble 1983: 541–2; Fantham 1992: 35–6; Roche 2009: 51–3.

the poetic *ensis* are both frequent and evenly distributed in *BC* whereas the former is much rarer in Virgil (287–8n.). Prosaic or technical language is prevalent. The language of military prose is virtually ubiquitous: words such as *agger*, *uallum*, *eminus* and *statio*, *explico* ‘deploys’ and *constituo* ‘stations’;<sup>67</sup> note too, e.g., phrases such as 15 *post domitas gentes*, 497 *in densos agitur cuneos* or 733 *succedere uallo*. The language of the law and legal proceedings is frequently recalled in such terms as 34 *ratus*, 55 *iuris habere sui* (legal or military authority), 351 *sancire* or 395 *nocte coacta*, while 87 *placet* may in its context evoke senatorial usage. It is important to note that this more prosaic diction is a tendency, not an invariable rule, and that Lucan regularly uses words and constructions considered to be poetic or elevated. For example, *coniunx* appears twice in *BC* 7 (× 38 in *BC*), while *uxor*, the everyday term, appears only once in the poem. In *BC* 7 one encounters compound adjectives such as *sonipes* (used substantively as commonly as *equus* in *BC*) or *caelicola*; compound adjectives in *-fer* (*letifer*, *signifer*, *fumifer*, *pestifer*) or with *-fic-* (*luctificus Titan*, *pacificus*); epic periphrases such as *Thessalicae* . . . *orae* and ‘poetic’ constructions such as *prospera rerum* (107–8n.), *audax* or *cupidus* with the infinitive (246, 266), or the infinitive of purpose (481).

Lucan very frequently arranges words within their sentence or hexameter line for effect. Enjambment gives emphasis to a word or phrase by putting it at the beginning of a new line, often as the last word in a sense unit. Thus at 455–6 *cladis tamen huius habemus* | *uindictam*, the key term *uindictam* – the pivot by which the narrator turns from the declaration that ‘human affairs are the concern of no gods’ to the concept of deifying emperors as vengeance for Pharsalus – is enjambed before a sense pause at the strong caesura. Enjambment can sharpen a rhetorical point, as when Cicero concludes his speech to Pompey with the barb 84–5 ‘*scire senatus auet, miles te, Magne, sequitur* | *an comes*’ (cf. also 292 (Caesar) ‘. . . | *uicistis*’, 360 (Pompey) ‘. . . *hinc starent*’). The same strategy is often used for surprise or emotive effect: cf. 659 *potest* . . . *Magnus* | *esse miser* (where the reader may well expect *mori*) or the shock-value of lines such as 182–3 *quae patrum iugulos, quae pectora fratrum* | *sperabat* or 445–6 *sunt nobis nulla profecto* | *numina*. The ‘surprise effect’ of enjambment is commonly exploited in hyperboles such as 728–9 *Hesperio uidit* . . . *arua natare* | *sanguine* or 790–1 *excelsos* . . . *aequantia colles* | *corpora*.

Hyperbaton, the disruption of normal word order for aesthetic effect, is another very common strategy for emphasis. The early placement of an adjective can create a sense of suspense that is ‘resolved’ by its noun, as at 201–2 *dissimilem certe cunctis quos explicat egit* | *Thessalicum natura diem* or

<sup>67</sup> Fantham 1992: 35 on the first four words listed: ‘professional military language’; for *explico* and *constituo* see 416–17, 417–18nn.

373 *atque ipsam domini metuentem occurrere Romam*. Nouns and their adjectives can be separated to artfully enclose the hexameter line, as at 196 *impia concurrunt Pompei et Caesaris arma* or 478 *extremique fragor conuexa irrumpit Olympi*. A related phenomenon, though not as frequent in *BC* as in Virgil or Ovid, is the mannered arrangement of epithets and nouns framing a central verb within a single line (a 'golden line'):<sup>68</sup> used to round off a period, as at 8 *sollicitos uana decepit imagine somnos*, 859 *pluraque ruricolis feriuntur dentibus ossa* and 167 *nullaque funestis inuenta est uictima sacris*, or to enhance dignity, as at 64 (of Cicero) *pacificas saeuus tremuit Catilina secures*. Words can also be suggestively juxtaposed. This may have an emotive effect, such as at 30 *patriaegue tibiue* (Pompey); or may more generally stress or suggest an association, as at 53 *soceri Pompeius*, 138 *urbi Magnoque timetur* or 169 *Eumenidas, Caesar*; or it may contrast opposing elements, whether topographical (134 *litora ponto*), geographical (188 *bibit Romanus Araxen*) or supernatural (770 *superam Stygia*).

The metre of *BC* coheres strongly with the metrical patterns of the *Aeneid*.<sup>69</sup> The first four feet of the hexameter line yield sixteen possible variations in the arrangement of dactyls and spondees. The four commonest of these metrical patterns in *BC*, accounting for over 50 per cent of the lines in the poem, are (i) DSSS, (ii) DSDS, (iii) DDSS and (iv) SDSS.<sup>70</sup> The metre of *BC* 7 is consistent with this overall tendency: these four patterns account for just over half of the total lines of the book (443 lines; DSDS:  $\times 128$ , DSSS:  $\times 122$ , SDSS:  $\times 106$ , DDSS:  $\times 87$ ).<sup>71</sup> These are also the four commonest patterns in Virgil's *Aeneid*, albeit with second and third place in reverse order; in the *Aeneid* these four patterns account for just under half of the total lines of the poem (46.95 per cent). In *BC*, as in the *Aeneid*, a predilection for spondee-heavy patterns results in lines predominated by spondees in the first four feet.<sup>72</sup> In *BC* 7 this difference is marked: there are over one third more spondees than dactyls in these feet.

A conspicuous point of difference between the metre of *BC* and that of the *Aeneid* is that Lucan avoids elision: there are only 126 instances in all of *BC* 7 (*Aeneid* 1 has the fewest elisions in Virgil's epic: 361) and only seven lines where elision occurs more than once (164, 373, 541, 679,

<sup>68</sup> See Wilkinson 1963: 215–17; Conrad 1965: 234–41.

<sup>69</sup> On Lucan's metre: Duckworth 1967, 1969: esp. 100–1; Ollfors 1967.

<sup>70</sup> Duckworth 1969: 100–1 (his exact figure is 52.28 per cent). His next four most frequent patterns are (v) SSDS ( $\times 70$  in *BC* 7), (vi) DDDS ( $\times 57$  in *BC* 7), (vii) DSSD ( $\times 63$  in *BC* 7), (viii) SDDS ( $\times 42$  in *BC* 7). The top eight patterns account for just under 80 per cent (78.61 per cent) of the lines in *BC*.

<sup>71</sup> 51.27 per cent of 864 lines: in these calculations I have not counted lines omitted in this edition (154, 161, 257–8, 746–9) or the two half-lines created by the removal of 746–9.

<sup>72</sup> Duckworth 1969: 138.

769, 825, 867). When elision does occur, it seems unremarkable: e.g. sixty-one examples involve elision of *-que* (of these, sixteen occur after the first long syllable of the fourth foot: a very common Virgilian pattern<sup>73</sup>). No spondaic fifth feet occur in *BC* 7 (there are fourteen in total in *BC*; thirty-three in all of Virgil's works).

Metre is nevertheless often expressive in *BC*. Lines that slow conspicuously may do so for various effects: to enhance a dignified entrance, as at 62 (Cicero) *cunctorum uoces Romani maximus auctor* (SSSS), or to stress an emotive or horrific detail, as at 539 *aut, si Romano compleri sanguine mauis* (SSSS). A succession of spondees may appear in combination with other devices to emphasize a key phrase or point: e.g. 643 (in enjambment) *in regnum nasci* or 813 (enhanced by anaphora) *uret cum terris, uret cum gurgite ponti*. Lucan's metrical choices sometimes appear motivated by mimetic effects. For example, at 215 the sequence SSSS is apt for an army's orderly descent to the plain; at 608 three consecutive spondees may imitate the mortally wounded Domitius struggling to speak. Such effects are more rarely the result of dactyls, but at 3 a predominantly dactylic line (DSDD) describes the sun driving its horses against the ether and at 590 a totally dactylic line dissuades Brutus from a reckless charge through the enemy.

### 13 TRANSMISSION AND TEXT

Lucan's *De bello civili* was an instant classic whose influence on literature was immediate and lasting.<sup>74</sup> Demand for copies of the poem was such that it survives from antiquity in over 400 complete and fragmentary codices and manuscripts.<sup>75</sup> Fragments of three ancient books are still extant; one set from a codex of the fourth or fifth century (Π) contains lines 458–537 of book 7 (cf. 463–2, 462–4nn.). Also preserved are two sets of ancient commentary (they are referred to in this edition by the abbreviations *ASL* and *Comm. Bern.*; their evidence on textual variants is cited as *C*); these contain material at least as old as Servius' commentary on the

<sup>73</sup> Tarrant 2012: 42 'unmarked . . . hardly noticeable'.

<sup>74</sup> On Lucan and contemporary literature perhaps the most famous example is Eumolpius' poem at Petr. 118, for which see the comments at Fantham 1992: 228–30. On aspects of his early reception see e.g. Ginsburg 2017: index s.v. *Bellum Civile* (Lucan) on the *Octavia* of c. 68 CE; Newlands 2011a on Stat. *Silv.* 2.7 (published 93 CE) and 2011b: 224–54; on Lucan and the Flavian epics see e.g. Stover 2014 on V. Fl., Roche 2016 on Stat. *Theb.*, and Marks 2009 on Sil. On aspects of Lucan's reception in the poetry of late Antiquity see e.g. Walter 2009 on Prudentius; Ware 2012: index s.v. 'Lucan', and the essays in Nelis, Galli Milić and Berlincourt 2016 on Claudian; Nosarti 2009 on Dracontius and Corippus. Further work on his influence in Late Antiquity is needed.

<sup>75</sup> Badali 1973: 3–43.

*Aeneid*.<sup>76</sup> Five complete manuscripts survive from the ninth century: **M**, **Z**, **A**, **B** and **R**; of these **A**, **B** and **R** derive from **Z**. The complete tenth-century manuscripts are **G**, **U**, **P** and **V**. These are independent of **ZM**, but the interrelation between **ZMPGUV** was early and thoroughgoing to the degree that they are resistant to being grouped into families – ‘the true line of division is between the variants themselves, not between the manuscripts which offer them’;<sup>77</sup> the editor’s task is more frequently selection between variant readings rather than emendation.<sup>78</sup> Tarrant provides a succinct summary of Lucan’s transmission;<sup>79</sup> Gotoff offers a detailed examination of the ninth-century manuscripts **MZABR** (and their corrected versions).<sup>80</sup>

The text printed in this edition is based on that printed in Housman’s 1926 edition. Throughout the commentary I have discussed significant variants where they bear on the meaning of the text. The following table lists differences from Housman with reference to SB:

<i>locus</i>	<b>Roche</b>	<b>Housman</b>	<b>Shackleton Bailey</b>
43	<i>gemitus texere dolorem</i>	<i>gemitus edere dolorem</i>	<i>gemitus texere dolorem</i>
161	bracketed	bracketed	not bracketed
244	<i>casuram &lt;et&gt; fatis</i>	<i>casuram et fatis</i>	<i>casuram fatis</i>
351	<i>uolunt</i>	<i>uolent</i>	<i>uolent</i>
355	<i>possint</i>	<i>possent</i>	<i>possent</i>
387	<i>quidquid non expleat aetas</i>	<i>quidquid nona explicat aetas</i>	<i>quidquid non expleat aetas</i>
388	not bracketed	bracketed	not bracketed
390	<i>in orbem</i>	<i>in orbem</i>	<i>in †orbem†</i>
415	<i>possunt</i>	<i>possunt</i>	<i>possint</i>
431	<i>saeuas</i>	<i>saeuas</i>	<i>seras</i>
453	† <i>similest</i> †	<i>similes</i>	† <i>similest</i> †
463	<i>quae</i>	<i>quam</i>	<i>quae</i>
462	<i>manus</i>	<i>manum</i>	<i>manus</i>

<sup>76</sup> Esposito 2011: 453–63.

<sup>77</sup> Housman vii; cf. Tarrant 1983: 218 ‘an editor must regard any reading or variant not an obvious blunder that is found in one or more of the ninth- and tenth-century manuscripts as potentially ancient’.

<sup>78</sup> Gotoff 1971: 7.

<sup>79</sup> Tarrant 1983: 215–18.

<sup>80</sup> Gotoff 1971.

<i>locus</i>	<b>Roche</b>	<b>Housman</b>	<b>Shackleton Bailey</b>
464	<i>parentes</i>	<i>parentum</i>	<i>parentes</i>
477	<i>tendit</i>	<i>tendit</i>	<i>tundit</i>
504	<i>uergens</i>	<i>uertens</i>	<i>uergens</i>
505	<i>abstulit</i>	<i>abstulit</i>	<i>distulit</i>
522-3	lacuna after 522	no lacuna	no lacuna
616	<i>mersere</i>	<i>uertere</i>	<i>mersere</i>
658	<i>fouitque</i>	<i>uouitque</i>	† <i>uoluitque</i> †
666	<i>meum?</i>	<i>meum.</i>	<i>meum?</i>
746-9	<i>nec . . . duces</i> bracketed	<i>nec . . . duces</i> not bracketed	<i>nec . . . duces</i> bracketed
768	<i>nocentem</i>	<i>nocentes</i>	<i>nocentem</i>

## 14 MANUSCRIPTS CITED

<b>Z</b>	Paris Lat. 10314. Ninth century
<b>M</b>	Montpellier H 113. Ninth century
<b>A</b>	Ashburnhamensis, Paris BNF NAL 1626. Ninth century
<b>B</b>	Bern 45. Ninth century
<b>R</b>	Montpellier 362. Ninth century
<b>P</b>	Paris Lat. 7502. Tenth century
<b>G</b>	Brussels 5330-2 (previously Gembloux). Tenth century
<b>U</b>	Leiden Voss. Lat. F. 63. Tenth century
<b>V</b>	Leiden Voss. Lat. Q. 51. Tenth century
<b>Ω</b>	Consensus of <b>ZM</b> with two or more of <b>ABRPGUV</b>
<b>Π</b>	Vatican, Pal. Lat 24, fols. 11-14. Fourth or fifth century (contains 6.21-61, 6.228-67, 7.458-537)
<b>Z<sup>2</sup></b>	Corrections of <b>Z</b>
<b>M<sup>2</sup></b>	Corrections of <b>M</b>
<b>G<sup>2</sup></b>	Corrections of <b>G</b>
<b>A<sup>2</sup></b>	Corrections of <b>A</b>
<i>Comm. Bern.</i>	<i>Commenta Bernensia</i> . Bern 370. Ninth century (publ. Usener 1869)
<b>C</b>	The lemmata of <i>Comm. Bern.</i>
<b>ASL</b>	<i>Adnotationes Super Lucanum</i> . Bern 370 and Bodmer Lat. 182 (publ. Endt 1909)



M. ANNAEI LVCANI DE BELLO CIVILI  
LIBER SEPTIMVS



M. ANNAEI LVCANI DE BELLO CIVILI  
LIBER SEPTIMVS

---

Segnior Oceano quam lex aeterna uocabat  
luctificus Titan numquam magis aethera contra  
egit equos cursumque polo rapiente retorsit,  
defectusque pati uoluit raptaeque labores  
lucis, et attraxit nubes, non pabula flammis 5  
sed ne Thessalico purus luceret in orbe.

at nox felicitis Magno pars ultima uitae  
sollicitos uana decepit imagine somnos.  
nam Pompeiani uisus sibi sede theatri  
innumeram effigiem Romanae cernere plebis 10  
attollique suum laetis ad sidera nomen  
uocibus et plausu cuneos certare sonantes;  
qualis erat populi facies clamorque fauentis  
olim, cum iuuenis primique aetate triumphi,  
post domitas gentes quas torrens ambit Hiberus 15  
et quaecumque fugax Sertorius impulit arma,  
uespere pacato, pura uenerabilis aequae  
quam currus ornante toga, plaudente senatu  
sedit adhuc Romanus eques; seu fine bonorum  
anxia mens curis ad tempora laeta refugit, 20  
siue per ambages solitas contraria uisis  
uaticinata quies magni tulit omina planctus,  
seu uetito patrias ultra tibi cernere sedes  
sic Romam Fortuna dedit. ne rumpite somnos,  
castrorum uigiles, nullas tuba uerberet aures. 25  
crastina dira quies et imagine maesta diurna  
undique funestas acies feret, undique bellum.  
unde pares somnos populis noctemque beatam?  
o felix, si te uel sic tua Roma uideret!  
donassent utinam superi patriaeque tibi 30

unum, Magne, diem, quo fati certus uterque  
 extremum tanti fructum raperetis amoris.  
 tu uelut Ausonia uadis moriturus in urbe,  
 illa rati semper de te sibi conscia uoti  
 hoc scelus haud umquam fatis haerere putauit, 35  
 sic se dilecti tumulum quoque perdere Magni.  
 te mixto flesset luctu iuuenisque senexque  
 iniussusque puer; lacerasset crine soluto  
 pectora femineum ceu Bruti funere uulgus.  
 nunc quoque, tela licet paueant uictoris iniqui, 40  
 nuntiet ipse licet Caesar tua funera, flebunt,  
 sed dum tura ferunt, dum laurea sarta Tonanti.  
 o miseri, quorum gemitus texere dolorem,  
 qui te non pleno pariter planxere theatro.  
 uicerat astra iubar, cum mixto murmure turba 45  
 castrorum fremuit fatisque trahentibus orbem  
 signa petit pugnae. miseri pars maxima uulgi  
 non totum uisura diem tentoria circum  
 ipsa ducis queritur magnoque accensa tumultu  
 mortis uicinae properantes admouet horas. 50  
 dira subit rabies: sua quisque ac publica fata  
 praecipitare cupit; segnis pauidusque uocatur  
 ac nimium patiens soceri Pompeius, et orbis  
 indulgens regno, qui tot simul undique gentes  
 iuris habere sui uellet pacemque timeret. 55  
 nec non et reges populique queruntur Eoi  
 bella trahi patriaue procul tellure teneri.  
 hoc placet, o superi, cum uobis uertere cuncta  
 propositum, nostris erroribus addere crimen?  
 cladibus irruimus nocituraque poscimus arma; 60  
 in Pompeianis uotum est Pharsalia castris.  
 cunctorum uoces Romani maximus auctor  
 Tullius eloquii, cuius sub iure togaque  
 pacificas saeuus tremuit Catilina secures,  
 pertulit iratus bellis, cum rostra forumque 65  
 optaret passus tam longa silentia miles.  
 addidit inualidae robur facundia causae.  
 'hoc pro tot meritis solum te, Magne, precatur

uti se Fortuna uelis, proceresque tuorum  
 castrorum regesque tui cum supplice mundo 70  
 affusi uinci socerum patiare rogamus.  
 humani generis tam longo tempore bellum  
 Caesar erit? merito Pompeium uincere lente  
 gentibus indignum est a transcurrente subactis.  
 quo tibi feruor abit aut quo fiducia fati? 75  
 de superis, ingratis, times causamque senatus  
 credere dis dubitas? ipsae tua signa reuellent  
 prosilientque acies: pudeat uicisse coactum.  
 si duce te iusso, si nobis bella geruntur,  
 sit iuris, quocumque uelint concurrere campo. 80  
 quid mundi gladios a sanguine Caesaris arces?  
 uibrant tela manus, uix signa morantia quisquam  
 expectat: propera, ne te tua classica linquant.  
 scire senatus auet, miles te, Magne, sequatur  
 an comes.' ingemuit rector sensitque deorum 85  
 esse dolos et fata suae contraria menti:  
 'si placet hoc' inquit 'cunctis, si milite Magno,  
 non duce tempus eget, nil ultra fata morabor:  
 inuoluat populos una fortuna ruina  
 sitque hominum magnae lux ista nouissima parti. 90  
 testor, Roma, tamen Magnum quo cuncta perirent  
 accepisse diem. potuit tibi uulnere nullo  
 stare labor belli; potui sine caede subactum  
 captiuumque ducem uiolatae tradere paci.  
 quis furor, o caeci, scelerum? ciuilia bella 95  
 gesturi metuunt ne non cum sanguine uincant.  
 abstulimus terras, exclusimus aequore toto,  
 ad praematuras segetum ieiuna rapinas  
 agmina compulimus, uotumque effecimus hosti  
 ut mallet sterni gladiis mortemque suorum 100  
 permiscere meis. belli pars magna peracta est  
 his, quibus effectum est ne pugnam tiro paueret,  
 si modo uirtutis stimulis iraeque calore  
 signa petunt. multos in summa pericula misit  
 uenturi timor ipse mali. fortissimus ille est 105  
 qui, promptus metuenda pati, si comminus instent,

et differre potest. placet haec tam prospera rerum  
tradere fortunae, gladio permittere mundi  
discrimen; pugnare ducem quam uincere malunt.  
res mihi Romanas dederas, Fortuna, regendas: 110  
accipe maiores et caeco in Marte tuere.  
Pompei nec crimen erit nec gloria bellum.  
uincis apud superos uotis me, Caesar, iniquis:  
pugnatur. quantum scelerum quantumque malorum  
in populos lux ista feret! quot regna iacebunt! 115  
sanguine Romano quam turbidus ibit Enipeus!  
prima uelim caput hoc funesti lancea belli,  
si sine momento rerum partisque ruina  
casurum est, feriat; neque enim uictoria Magno  
laetior. aut populis inuisum hac clade peracta 120  
aut hodie Pompeius erit miserabile nomen:  
omne malum uicti, quod sors feret ultima rerum,  
omne nefas uictoris erit.' sic fatur et arma  
permittit populis frenosque furentibus ira  
laxat et ut uictus uiolento nauita Coro 125  
dat regimen uentis ignauumque arte relictā  
puppis onus trahitur. trepido confusa tumultu  
castra fremunt, animique truces sua pectora pulsant  
ictibus incertis. multorum pallor in ore  
mortis uenturae faciesque simillima fato. 130  
aduenisse diem qui fatum rebus in aeuum  
conderet humanis, et quaeri, Roma quid esset,  
illo Marte, palam est. sua quisque pericula nescit  
attonitus maiore metu. quis litora ponto  
obruta, quis summis cernens in montibus aequor 135  
aetheraque in terras deiecto sole cadentem,  
tot rerum finem, timeat sibi? non uacat ullos  
pro se ferre metus: urbi Magnoque timetur.  
nec gladiis habuere fidem, nisi cautibus asper  
exarsit mucro; tunc omnis lancea saxo 140  
erigitur, tendunt neruis melioribus arcus,  
cura fuit lectis pharetras implere sagittis,  
auget eques stimulos frenorumque artat habenas.  
si liceat superis hominum conferre labores,

non aliter Phlegra rabidos tollente gigantas 145  
 Martius incaluit Siculis incudibus ensis  
 et rubuit flammis iterum Neptunia cuspis  
 spiculaque extenso Paeon Pythone recoxit,  
 Pallas Gorgoneos diffudit in aegida crines,  
 Pallenaëa Ioui mutauit fulmina Cyclops. 150

non tamen abstinuit uenturos prodere casus  
 per uarias Fortuna notas. nam, Thessala rura  
 cum peterent, totus uenientibus obstitit aether  
 [inque oculis hominum fregerunt fulmina nubes]  
 aduersasque faces immensoque igne columnas 155

et trabibus mixtis auidos typhonas aquarum  
 detulit atque oculos ingesto fulgure clausit;  
 excussit cristas galeis capulosque solutis  
 perfudit gladiis ereptaque pila liquauit,  
 aetherioque nocens fumauit sulphure ferrum; 160

[nec non innumero cooperta examine signa]  
 uixque reuulsa solo maiori pondere pressum  
 signiferi mersere caput rorantia fletu  
 usque ad Thessaliam Romana et publica signa.  
 admotus superis discussa fugit ab ara 165

taurus et Emathios praeceps se iecit in agros,  
 nullaque funestis inuenta est uictima sacris.  
 (at tu quos scelerum superos, quas rite uocasti  
 Eumenidas, Caesar? Stygii quae numina regni  
 infernumque nefas et mersos nocte furores 170  
 impia tam saeue gesturus bella litasti?)

iam (dubium, monstribusne deum, nimione pauore  
 crediderint) multis concurrere uisus Olympo  
 Pindus et abruptis mergi conuallibus Haemus,  
 edere nocturnas belli Pharsalia uoces, 175

ire per Ossaeam rapidus Boebeida sanguis;  
 inque uicem uultus tenebris mirantur opertos  
 et pallere diem galeisque incumbere noctem  
 defunctosque patres et iuncti sanguinis umbras  
 ante oculos uolitare suos. sed mentibus unum 180  
 hoc solamen erat, quod uoti turba nefandi  
 conscia, quae patrum iugulos, quae pectora fratrum

sperabat, gaudet monstis, mentisque tumultum  
 atque omen scelerum subitos putat esse furores.

quid mirum populos quos lux extrema manebat 185  
 lymphato trepidasse metu, praesaga malorum  
 si data mens homini est? Tyriis qui Gadibus hospes  
 adiacet Armeniumque bibit Romanus Araxen,  
 sub quocumque die, quocumque est sidere mundi,  
 maeret et ignorat causas animumque dolentem 190  
 corripit, Emathiis quid perdat nescius aruis.  
 Euganeo, si uera fides memorantibus, augur  
 colle sedens, Aponus terris ubi fumifer exit  
 atque Antenorei dispergitur unda Timauī,  
 ‘uenit summa dies, geritur res maxima,’ dixit 195  
 ‘impia concurrunt Pompei et Caesaris arma’,  
 seu tonitrus ac tela Iouis praesaga notauit,  
 aethera seu totum discordi obsistere caelo  
 perspexitque polos, seu numen in aethere maestum  
 solis in obscuro pugnam pallore notauit. 200  
 dissimilem certe cunctis quos explicat egit  
 Thessalicum natura diem: si cuncta perito  
 augure mens hominum caeli noua signa notasset,  
 spectari toto potuit Pharsalia mundo.

o summos hominum, quorum fortuna per orbem 205  
 signa dedit, quorum fati caelum omne uacauit!  
 haec et apud seras gentes populosque nepotum,  
 siue sua tantum uenient in saecula fama  
 siue aliquid magnis nostri quoque cura laboris  
 nominibus prodesse potest, cum bella legentur, 210  
 spesque metusque simul perituraque uota mouebunt,  
 attonitique omnes ueluti uenientia fata,  
 non transmissa, legent et adhuc tibi, Magne, fauebunt.

miles, ut aduerso Phoebi radiatus ab ictu  
 descendens totos perfudit lumine colles, 215  
 non temere immissus campis: stetit ordine certo  
 infelix acies. cornus tibi cura sinistri,  
 Lentule, cum prima, quae tum fuit optima bello,  
 et quarta legione datur. tibi, numine pugnax  
 aduerso Domiti, dextri frons tradita Martis. 220



at medii robur belli fortissima densant  
 agmina, quae Cilicum terris deducta tenebat  
 Scipio, miles in hoc, Libyco dux primus in orbe.  
 at iuxta fluuios et stagna undantis Enipei  
 Cappadocum montana cohors et largus habenae 225  
 Ponticus ibat eques. sicci sed plurima campi  
 tetrarchae regesque tenent magnique tyranni  
 atque omnis Latio quae seruit purpura ferro.  
 illuc et Libye Numidas et Creta Cydonas  
 misit, Itryaeis cursus fuit inde sagittis, 230  
 inde, truces Galli, solitum prodistis in hostem,  
 illic pugnaces commouit Hiberia caetras.  
 eripe uictori gentes et sanguine mundi  
 fuso, Magne, semel totos consume triumphos.  
 illo forte die Caesar statione relictā 235  
 ad segetum raptus moturus signa repente  
 conspicit in planos hostem descendere campos,  
 oblatumque uidet uotis sibi mille petitem  
 tempus, in extremos quo mitteret omnia casus.  
 aeger quippe morae flagransque cupidine regni 240  
 coeperat exiguo tractu ciuilia bella  
 ut lentum damnare nefas. discrimina postquam  
 aduentare ducum supremaque proelia uidit  
 casuram <et> fatis sensit nutare ruinam,  
 illa quoque in ferrum rabies promptissima paulum 245  
 languit, et casus audax spondere secundos  
 mens stetit in dubio, quam nec sua fata timere  
 nec Magni sperare sinunt. formidine mersa  
 prosilit hortando melior fiducia uulgo.  
 'o domitor mundi, rerum fortuna mearum, 250  
 miles, adest totiens optatae copia pugnae.  
 nil opus est uotis, iam fatum accersite ferro.  
 in manibus uestris, quantus sit Caesar, habetis.  
 haec est illa dies mihi quam Rubiconis ad undas  
 promissam memini, cuius spe mouimus arma, 255  
 in quam distulimus uetitos remeare triumphos,  
 [haec eadem est hodie quae pignora quaeque penates  
 reddat et merito faciat uos Marte colonos]

haec, fato quae teste probet, quis iustius arma  
 sumpserit; haec acies uictum factura nocentem est. 260  
 si pro me patriam ferro flammisque petistis,  
 nunc pugnate truces gladioque exsoluite culpam:  
 nulla manus, belli mutato iudice, pura est.  
 non mihi res agitur, sed, uos ut libera sitis  
 turba, precor gentes ut ius habeatis in omnes. 265  
 ipse ego priuatae cupidus me reddere uitae  
 plebeiaque toga modicum componere ciuem,  
 omnia dum uobis liceant, nihil esse recuso.  
 inuidia regnate mea. nec sanguine multo  
 spem mundi petitis: Grais delecta iuuentus 270  
 gymnasiis aderit studioque ignaua palaestrae  
 et uix arma ferens, aut mixtae dissona turbae  
 barbaries, non illa tubas, non agmine moto  
 clamorem latura suum. ciuilia paucae  
 bella manus facient: pugnae pars magna leuabit 275  
 his orbem populis Romanumque obteret hostem.  
 ite per ignauas gentes famosaque regna  
 et primo ferri motu prosternite mundum;  
 sitque palam, quas tot duxit Pompeius in urbem  
 curribus, unius gentes non esse triumphii. 280  
 Armeniosne mouet Romana potentia cuius  
 sit ducis, aut emptum minimo uult sanguine quisquam  
 barbarus Hesperiiis Magnum praeponere rebus?  
 Romanos odere omnes, dominosque grauantur,  
 quos nouere, magis. sed me fortuna meorum 285  
 commisit manibus, quarum me Gallia testem  
 tot fecit bellis. cuius non militis ensem  
 agnoscam? caelumque tremens cum lancea transit  
 dicere non fallar quo sit uibrata lacerto.  
 quod si, signa ducem numquam fallentia uestrum, 290  
 conspicio faciesque truces oculosque minaces,  
 uicistis. uideor fluuios spectare cruoris  
 calcatosque simul reges sparsumque senatus  
 corpus et immensa populos in caede natantes.  
 sed mea fata moror, qui uos in tela furentes 295  
 uocibus his teneo. ueniam date bella trahenti:

spe trepido; haud umquam uidi tam magna daturos  
 tam prope me superos; camporum limite paruo  
 absumus a uotis. ego sum cui Marte peracto  
 quae populi regesque tenent donare licebit. 300  
 quone poli motu, quo caeli sidere uerso  
 Thessalicae tantum, superi, permittitis orae?  
 aut merces hodie bellorum aut poena parata.  
 Caesareas spectate cruces, spectate catenas,  
 et caput hoc positum rostris effusaque membra 305  
 Saeptorumque nefas et clausi proelia Campi.  
 cum duce Sullano gerimus ciuilia bella.  
 uestri cura mouet, nam me secura manebit  
 sors quaesita manu: fodientem uiscera cernet  
 me mea qui nondum uicto respexerit hoste. 310  
 di, quorum curas abduxit ab aethere tellus  
 Romanusque labor, uincat quicumque necesse  
 non putat in uictos saeuum destringere ferrum  
 quique suos ciues, quod signa aduersa tulerunt,  
 non credit fecisse nefas. Pompeius in arto 315  
 agmina uestra loco uetita uirtute moueri  
 cum tenuit, quanto satiauit sanguine ferrum!  
 uos tamen hoc oro, iuuenes, ne cadere quisquam  
 hostis terga uelit: ciuis qui fugerit esto.  
 sed, dum tela micant, non uos pietatis imago 320  
 ulla nec aduersa conspecti fronte parentes  
 commoueant; uultus gladio turbate uerendos.  
 siue quis infesto cognata in pectora ferro  
 ibit, seu nullum uiolarit uulnere pignus,  
 ignoti iugulum tamquam scelus imputet hostis. 325  
 sternite iam uallum fossasque implete ruina,  
 exeat ut plenae acies non sparsa manipulis.  
 parcite ne castris: uallo tendetis in illo  
 unde acies peritura uenit.' uix cuncta locuto  
 Caesare quemque suum munus trahit, armaque raptim 330  
 sumpta Ceresque uiris. capiunt praesagia belli  
 calcatisque ruunt castris; stant ordine nullo,  
 arte ducis nulla, permittuntque omnia fatis.  
 si totidem Magni soceros totidemque petentes

urbis regna suae funesto in Marte locasses, 335  
 non tam praecipiti ruerent in proelia cursu.  
 uidit ut hostiles in rectum exire cateruas  
 Pompeius nullasque moras permittere bello  
 sed superis placuisse diem, stat corde gelato  
 attonitus; tantoque duci sic arma timere 340  
 omen erat. premit inde metus, totumque per agmen  
 sublimi praeuectus equo 'quem flagitat' inquit  
 'uestra diem uirtus, finis ciuilibus armis,  
 quem quaesistis, adest. totas effundite uires:  
 extremum ferri superest opus, unaque gentes 345  
 hora trahit. quisquis patriam carosque penates,  
 qui subolem ac thalamos desertaque pignora quaerit,  
 ense petat: medio posuit deus omnia campo.  
 causa iubet melior superos sperare secundos:  
 ipsi tela regent per uiscera Caesaris, ipsi 350  
 Romanas sancire uolunt hoc sanguine leges.  
 si socero dare regna meo mundumque pararent,  
 praecipitare meam fatis potuere senectam:  
 non iratorum populis urbique deorum est  
 Pompeium seruare ducem. quae uincere possint 355  
 omnia contulimus. subiere pericula clari  
 sponte uiri sacraque antiquus imagine miles.  
 si Curios his fata darent reducesque Camillos  
 temporibus Deciosque caput fatale uouentes,  
 hinc starent. primo gentes oriente coactae 360  
 innumeraeque urbes, quantas in proelia numquam,  
 exciuiere manus. toto simul utimur orbe.  
 quidquid signiferi comprehensum limite caeli  
 sub Noton et Borean hominum sumus, arma mouemus.  
 nonne superfusis collectum cornibus hostem 365  
 in medium dabimus? paucas uictoria dextras  
 exigit, at plures tantum clamore cateruae  
 bella gerent: Caesar nostris non sufficit armis.  
 credite pendentes e summis moenibus urbis  
 crinibus effusis hortari in proelia matres; 370  
 credite grandaeuum uetitumque aetate senatum  
 arma sequi sacros pedibus prosternere canos

atque ipsam domini metuentem occurrere Romam;  
 credite qui nunc est populus populumque futurum  
 permixtas afferre preces: haec libera nasci, 375  
 haec uult turba mori. siquis post pignora tanta  
 Pompeo locus est, cum prole et coniuge supplex,  
 imperii salua si maiestate liceret,  
 uoluerer ante pedes. Magnus, nisi uincitis, exul,  
 ludibrium soceri, uester pudor, ultima fata 380  
 deprecor ac turpes extremi cardinis annos,  
 ne discam seruire senex.' tam maesta locuti  
 uoce ducis flagrant animi, Romanaque uirtus  
 erigitur, placuitque mori, si uera timeret.  
 ergo utrimque pari procurrunt agmina motu 385  
 irarum; metus hos regni, spes excitat illos.  
 hae facient dextrae, quidquid non expleat aetas  
 ulla nec humanum reparet genus omnibus annis  
 ut uacet a ferro. gentes Mars iste futuras  
 obruet et populos aeu uenientis in orbem 390  
 erepto natale feret. tunc omne Latinum  
 fabula nomen erit; Gabios Veiosque Coramque  
 puluere uix tectae poterunt monstrare ruinae  
 Albanosque lares Laurentinosque penates,  
 rus uacuum, quod non habitet nisi nocte coacta 395  
 inuitus questusque Numam iussisse senator.  
 non aetas haec carpsit edax monumentaque rerum  
 putria destituit: crimen ciuile uidemus  
 tot uacuas urbes. generis quo turba redacta est  
 humani! toto populi qui nascimur orbe 400  
 nec muros implere uiris nec possumus agros:  
 urbs nos una capit. uincto fossore coluntur  
 Hesperiae segetes, stat tectis putris auitis  
 in nullos ruitura domus, nulloque frequentem  
 ciue suo Romam sed mundi faece repletam 405  
 cladis eo dedimus, ne tanto in corpore bellum  
 iam possit ciuile geri. Pharsalia tanti  
 causa mali. cedant feralia nomina Cannae  
 et damnata diu Romanis Allia fastis.  
 tempora signauit leuiorum Roma malorum, 410

hunc uoluit nescire diem. pro tristia fata!  
 aera pestiferum tractu morbosque fluentes  
 insanamque famem permissasque ignibus urbes  
 moeniaque in praeceps laturos plena tremores  
 hi possunt explere uiri, quos undique traxit 415  
 in miseram Fortuna necem, dum munera longi  
 explicat eripiens aeui populosque ducesque  
 constituit campis, per quos tibi, Roma, ruenti  
 ostendat quam magna cadas. quae latius orbem  
 possedit, citius per prospera fata cucurrit? 420  
 omne tibi bellum gentes dedit, omnibus annis  
 te geminum Titan procedere uidit in axem;  
 haud multum terrae spatium restabat Eoae  
 ut tibi nox, tibi tota dies, tibi curreret aether,  
 omniaque errantes stellae Romana uiderent. 425  
 sed retro tua fata tulit par omnibus annis  
 Emathiae funesta dies. hac luce cruenta  
 effectum, ut Latios non horreat India fasces,  
 nec uetitos errare Dahas in moenia ducat  
 Sarmaticumque premat succinctus consul aratrum, 430  
 quod semper saeuas debet tibi Parthia poenas,  
 quod fugiens ciuile nefas redituraque numquam  
 Libertas ultra Tigrim Rhenumque recessit  
 ac, totiens nobis iugulo quaesita, uagatur  
 Germanum Scythicumque bonum, nec respicit ultra 435  
 Ausoniam, uellem populis incognita nostris.  
 uulturis ut primum laeue fundata uolatu  
 Romulus infami compleuit moenia luco,  
 usque ad Thessalicas seruisses, Roma, ruinas.  
 de Brutis, Fortuna, queror. quid tempora legum 440  
 egimus aut annos a consule nomen habentes?  
 felices Arabes Medique Eoque tellus,  
 quam sub perpetuis tenuerunt fata tyrannis.  
 ex populis qui regna ferunt sors ultima nostra est,  
 quos seruire pudet. sunt nobis nulla profecto 445  
 numina: cum caeco rapiantur saecula casu,  
 mentimur regnare Iouem. spectabit ab alto  
 aethere Thessalicas, teneat cum fulmina, caedes?

scilicet ipse petet Pholoen, petet ignibus Oeten  
 immeritaeque nemus Rhodopes pinusque Mimantis, 450  
 Cassius hoc potius feriet caput? astra Thyestae  
 intulit et subitis damnauit noctibus Argos:  
 tot † similes † fratrum gladios patrumque gerenti  
 Thessaliae dabit ille diem? mortalia nulli  
 sunt curata deo. cladis tamen huius habemus 455  
 uindictam, quantam terris dare numina fas est:  
 bella pares superis facient ciuilia diuos,  
 fulminibus manes radiisque ornabit et astris  
 inque deum templis iurabit Roma per umbras.  
 ut rapido cursu fati suprema morantem 460  
 consumpsere locum, parua tellure dirempti,  
 quo sua pila cadant aut quae sibi fata minentur 463  
 inde manus, spectant. penitus quo noscere possent 462  
 facturi quae monstra forent, uidere parentes 464  
 frontibus aduersis fraternaue comminus arma, 465  
 nec libuit mutare locum. tamen omnia torpor  
 pectora constrinxit, gelidusque in uiscera sanguis  
 percussa pietate coit, totaeque cohortes  
 pila parata diu tensis tenere lacertis.  
 di tibi non mortem, quae cunctis poena paratur, 470  
 sed sensum post fata tuae dent, Crastine, morti,  
 cuius torta manu commisit lancea bellum  
 primaque Thessaliam Romano sanguine tinxit.  
 o praeceps rabies! cum Caesar tela teneret,  
 inuenta est prior ulla manus? tum stridulus aer 475  
 elisus lituis conceptaque classica cornu,  
 tunc ausae dare signa tubae, tunc aethera tendit  
 extremique fragor conuexa irrumpit Olympi,  
 unde procul nubes, quo nulla tonitrua durant.  
 exceptit resonis clamorem uallibus Haemus 480  
 Peliacisque dedit rursus geminare cauernis,  
 Pindus agit fremitus Pangaeaque saxa resultant  
 Oetaeaeque gemunt rupes, uocesque furoris  
 expauere sui tota tellure relatas.  
 spargitur innumerum diuersis missile uotis: 485  
 uulnera pars optat, pars terrae figere tela

ac puras seruare manus. rapit omnia casus	
atque incerta facit quos uult Fortuna nocentes.	488
tunc et Ityraei Medique Arabesque soluti,	514
arcu turba minax, nusquam rexere sagittas,	
sed petitur solus qui campis imminet aer;	
inde cadunt mortes. sceleris sed crimine nullo	
externum maculant chalybem: stetit omne coactum	
circa pila nefas. ferro subtexitur aether	
noxque super campos telis conserta pependit.	520
sed quota pars cladis iaculis ferroque uolanti	489
exacta est! odiis solus ciuilibus ensis	490
sufficit, et dextras Romana in uiscera ducit.	
Pompei densis acies stipata cateruis	
iunxerat in seriem nexis umbonibus arma,	
uixque habitura locum dextras ac tela mouendi	
constiterat gladiosque suos compressa timebat.	495
praecipiti cursu uesanum Caesaris agmen	
in densos agitur cuneos, perque arma, per hostem	
quaerit iter. qua torta graues lorica catenas	
opponit tutoque latet sub tegmine pectus,	
hac quoque peruentum est ad uiscera, totque per arma	500
extremum est quod quisque ferit. ciuilia bella	
una acies patitur, gerit altera; frigidus inde	
stat gladius, calet omne nocens a Caesare ferrum.	
nec Fortuna diu rerum tot pondera uergens	
abstulit ingentes fato torrente ruinas.	505
ut primum toto diduxit cornua campo	
Pompeianus eques bellicque per ultima fudit,	
sparsa per extremos leuis armatura maniplos	
insequitur saeuasque manus immittit in hostem:	
illic quaeque suo miscet gens proelia telo,	510
Romanus cunctis petitur cruor; inde sagittae,	
inde faces et saxa uolant spatioque solutae	
aeris et calido liquefactae pondere glandes;	513
cum Caesar, metuens ne frons sibi prima labaret	521
incursu, tenet obliquas post signa cohortes,	
.....	



inque latus belli, qua se uagus hostis agebat,  
 emittit subitum non motis cornibus agmen.  
 immemores pugnae nulloque pudore timendi 525  
 praecipites fecere palam ciuilia bella  
 non bene barbaricis umquam commissa cateruis.  
 ut primum sonipes transfixus pectora ferro  
 in caput effusi calcauit membra regentis,  
 omnis eques cessit campis, glomerataque nubes 530  
 in sua conuersis praeceps ruit agmina frenis.  
 perdidit inde modum caedes, ac nulla secuta est  
 pugna, sed hinc iugulis, hinc ferro bella geruntur;  
 nec ualet haec acies tantum prosternere quantum  
 inde perire potest. utinam, Pharsalia, campis 535  
 sufficiat cruor iste tuis, quem barbara fundunt  
 pectora; non alio mutantur sanguine fontes;  
 hic numerus totos tibi uestiat ossibus agros.  
 aut, si Romano compleri sanguine mauis,  
 istis parce precor; uiuant Galataeque Syrique, 540  
 Cappadoces Gallique extremique orbis Hiberi,  
 Armenii, Cilices; nam post ciuilia bella  
 hic populus Romanus erit. semel ortus in omnes  
 it timor, et fatis datus est pro Caesare cursus.  
 uentum erat ad robur Magni mediasque cateruas. 545  
 quod totos errore uago perfuderat agros  
 constitit hic bellum, fortunaque Caesaris haesit.  
 non illic regum auxiliis collecta iuuentus  
 bella gerit ferrumque manus mouere rogatae:  
 ille locus fratres habuit, locus ille parentes. 550  
 hic furor, hic rabies, hic sunt tua crimina, Caesar.  
 hanc fuge, mens, partem belli tenebrisque relinque,  
 nullaque tantorum discat me uate malorum,  
 quam multum bellis liceat ciuilibus, aetas.  
 a potius pereant lacrimae pereantque querellae: 555  
 quidquid in hac acie gessisti, Roma, tacebo.  
 hic Caesar, rabies populis stimulusque furorum,  
 nequa parte sui pereat scelus, agmina circum  
 it uagus atque ignes animis flagrantibus addit.

inspicit et gladios, qui toti sanguine manent, 560  
 qui niteant primo tantum mucrone cruenti,  
 quae presso tremat ense manus, quis languida tela,  
 quis contenta ferat, quis praestet bella iubenti,  
 quem pugnare iuuat, quis uultum ciue perempto  
 mutet; obit latis proiecta cadauera campis; 565  
 uulnera multorum totum fusura cruorem  
 opposita premit ipse manu. quacumque uagatur,  
 sanguineum ueluti quatiens Bellona flagellum  
 Bistonas aut Mauors agitans si uerbere saeuo  
 Palladia stimulet turbatos aegide currus, 570  
 nox ingens scelerum est; caedes oriuntur et instar  
 immensae uocis gemitus, et pondere lapsi  
 pectoris arma sonant confractique ensibus enses.  
 ipse manu subicit gladios ac tela ministrat  
 aduersosque iubet ferro confundere uultus, 575  
 promouet ipse acies, impellit terga suorum,  
 uerbere conuersae cessantes excitat hastae,  
 in plebem uetat ire manus monstratque senatum:  
 scit cruor imperii qui sit, quae uiscera rerum,  
 unde petat Romam, libertas ultima mundi 580  
 quo steterit ferienda loco. permixta secundo  
 ordine nobilitas uenerandaque corpora ferro  
 urguntur; caedunt Lepidos caeduntque Metellos  
 Coruinosque simul Torquataque nomina, rerum  
 saepe duces summosque hominum te, Magne, remoto. 585  
 illic plebeia contextus casside uultus  
 ignotusque hosti quod ferrum, Brute, tenebas!  
 o decus imperii, spes o suprema senatus,  
 extremum tanti generis per saecula nomen,  
 ne rue per medios nimium temerarius hostis, 590  
 nec tibi fatales admoueris ante Philippos,  
 Thessalia periture tua. nil proficis istic  
 Caesaris intentus iugulo: nondum attigit arcem,  
 iuris et humani columnen, quo cuncta premuntur,  
 egressus meruit fatis tam nobile letum. 595  
 uiuat et, ut Bruti procumbat uictima, regnet.  
 hic patriae perit omne decus: iacet aggere magno

patricium campis non mixta plebe cadauer.  
 mors tamen eminuit clarorum in strage uirorum  
 pugnacis Domiti, quem clades fata per omnes 600  
 ducebant: nusquam Magni fortuna sine illo  
 succubuit. uictus totiens a Caesare salua  
 libertate perit: tunc mille in uulnera laetus  
 labitur ac uenia gaudet caruisse secunda.

uiderat in crasso uersantem sanguine membra 605  
 Caesar, et increpitans 'iam Magni deseris arma,  
 successor Domiti; sine te iam bella geruntur'  
 dixerat. ast illi suffecit pectora pulsans  
 spiritus in uocem morientiaque ora resoluit.  
 'non te funesta scelerum mercede potitum 610  
 sed dubium fati, Caesar, generoque minorem  
 aspiciens Stygias Magno duce liber ad umbras  
 et securus eo: te, saeuo Marte subactum,  
 Pompeioque graues poenas nobisque daturum,  
 cum moriar, sperare licet.' non plura locutum 615  
 uita fugit, densaeque oculos mersere tenebrae.

impendisse pudet lacrimas in funere mundi  
 mortibus innumeris, ac singula fata sequentem  
 quaerere letiferum per cuius uiscera uulnus 620  
 exierit, quis fusa solo uitalia calcet,  
 ore quis aduerso demissum faucibus ense  
 expulerit moriens anima, quis corruat ictus,  
 quis steterit dum membra cadunt, qui pectore tela  
 transmittant aut quos campis affixerit hasta,  
 quis cruor emissis perruperit aera uenis 625  
 inque hostis cadat arma sui, quis pectora fratris  
 caedat et, ut notum possit spoliare cadauer,  
 abscisum longe mittat caput, ora parentis  
 quis laceret nimiaque probet spectantibus ira  
 quem iugulat non esse patrem. mors nulla querella 630  
 digna sua est, nullosque hominum lugere uacamus.  
 non istas habuit pugnae Pharsalia partes  
 quas aliae clades: illic per fata uirorum,  
 per populos hic Roma perit; quod militis illic,  
 mors hic gentis erat: sanguis ibi fluxit Achaeus, 635

Ponticus, Assyrius; cunctos haerere cruores  
 Romanus campisque uetat consistere torrens.  
 maius ab hac acie quam quod sua saecula ferrent  
 uulnus habent populi; plus est quam uita salusque  
 quod perit: in totum mundi prosternimur aeuum. 640  
 uincitur his gladiis omnis quae seruiet aetas.  
 proxima quid suboles aut quid meruere nepotes  
 in regnum nasci? pauide num gessimus arma  
 teximus aut iugulos? alieni poena timoris  
 in nostra ceruice sedet. post proelia natis 645  
 si dominum, Fortuna, dabas, et bella dedisses.  
 iam Magnus transisse deos Romanaque fata  
 senserat infelix, tota uix clade coactus  
 fortunam damnare suam. stetit aggere campi,  
 eminus unde omnes sparsas per Thessala rura 650  
 aspiceret clades, quae bello obstante latebant.  
 tot telis sua fata peti, tot corpora fusa  
 ac se tam multo pereuntem sanguine uidit.  
 nec, sicut mos est miseris, trahere omnia secum  
 mersa iuuat gentesque suae miscere ruinae: 655  
 ut Latiae post se uiuat pars maxima turbae,  
 sustinuit dignos etiamnunc credere uotis  
 caelicolas, fouitque sui solacia casus.  
 'parcite,' ait 'superi, cunctas prosternere gentes.  
 stante potest mundo Romaque superstite Magnus 660  
 esse miser. si plura iuuant mea uulnera, coniunx  
 est mihi, sunt nati: dedimus tot pignora fatis.  
 ciuiline parum est bello, si meque meosque  
 obruit? exiguae clades sumus orbe remoto?  
 omnia quid laceras? quid perdere cuncta laboras? 665  
 iam nihil est, Fortuna, meum?' sic fatur et arma  
 signaque et afflictas omni iam parte cateruas  
 circumit et reuocat matura in fata ruentes  
 seque negat tanti. nec derat robur in enses  
 ire duci iuguloque pati uel pectore letum. 670  
 sed timuit, strato miles ne corpore Magni  
 non fugeret, supraque ducem procumberet orbis;  
 Caesaris aut oculis uoluit subducere mortem.

nequiquam, infelix: socero spectare uolenti  
 praestandum est ubicumque caput. sed tu quoque, coniunx, 675  
 causa fugae uultusque tui fatisque negatum  
 parte absente mori. tum Magnum concitus aufert  
 a bello sonipes non tergo tela pauentem  
 ingentesque animos extrema in fata ferentem.  
 non gemitus, non fletus erat, saluaque uerendus 680  
 maiestate dolor, qualem te, Magne, decebat  
 Romanis praestare malis. non impare uultu  
 aspicias Emathiam: nec te uidere superbum  
 prospera bellorum nec fractum aduersa uidebunt;  
 quamque fuit laeto per tres infida triumphos 685  
 tam misero Fortuna minor. iam pondere fati  
 deposito securus abis; nunc tempora laeta  
 respexisse uacat, spes numquam implenda recessit;  
 quid fueris nunc scire licet. fuge proelia dira  
 ac testare deos nullum, qui perstet in armis, 690  
 iam tibi, Magne, mori. ceu flebilis Africa damnis  
 et ceu Munda nocens Pharioque a gurgite clades,  
 sic et Thessalicae post te pars maxima pugnae  
 non iam Pompei nomen populare per orbem  
 nec studium belli, sed par quod semper habemus, 695  
 Libertas et Caesar, erit; teque inde fugato  
 ostendit moriens sibi se pugnasse senatus.  
 nonne iuuat pulsum bellis cessisse nec istud  
 perspectasse nefas? spumantes caede cateruas  
 respice, turbatos incursu sanguinis amnes, 700  
 et soceri miserere tui. quo pectore Romam  
 intrabit factus campis felicior istis?  
 quidquid in ignotis solus regionibus exul,  
 quidquid sub Phario positus patiere tyranno,  
 crede deis, longo fatorum crede fauori, 705  
 uincere peius erat. prohibe lamenta sonare,  
 flere ueta populos, lacrimas luctusque remitte.  
 tam mala Pompei quam prospera mundus adoret.  
 aspice securus uultu non supplice reges,  
 aspice possessas urbes donataque regna, 710  
 Aegypton Libyamque, et terras elige morti.

uidit prima tuae testis Larisa ruinae  
 nobile nec uictum fatis caput. omnibus illa  
 ciuibus effudit totas per moenia uires  
 obuia ceu laeto: promittunt munera flentes, 715  
 pandunt templa, domos, socios se cladibus optant.  
 scilicet immenso superest ex nomine multum,  
 teque minor solo cunctas impellere gentes  
 rursus in arma potes rursusque in fata redire.  
 sed 'quid opus uicto populis aut urbibus?' inquit 720  
 'uictori praestate fidem.' tu, Caesar, in alto  
 caedis adhuc cumulo patriae per uiscera uadis,  
 at tibi iam populos donat gener. auehit inde  
 Pompeium sonipes; gemitus lacrimaeque sequuntur  
 plurimaque in saeuos populi conuicia diuos. 725  
 nunc tibi uera fides quaesiti, Magne, fauoris  
 contigit ac fructus: felix se nescit amari.

Caesar, ut Hesperio uidit satis arua natare  
 sanguine, parcendum ferro manibusque suorum  
 iam ratus ut uiles animas perituraque frustra 730  
 agmina permisit uitae. sed, castra fugatos  
 ne reuocent pellatque quies nocturna pauorem,  
 protinus hostili statuit succedere uallo,  
 dum fortuna calet, dum conficit omnia terror,  
 non ueritus graue ne fessis aut Marte subactis 735  
 hoc foret imperium. non magno hortamine miles  
 in praedam ducendus erat. 'uictoria nobis  
 plena, uiri:' dixit 'superest pro sanguine merces,  
 quam monstrare meum est; neque enim donare uocabo  
 quod sibi quisque dabit. cunctis, en, plena metallis 740  
 castra patent; raptum Hesperii e gentibus aurum  
 hic iacet Eoasque premunt tentoria gazas.  
 tot regum fortuna simul Magnique coacta  
 expectat dominos: propera praecedere, miles,  
 quos sequeris; quascumque tuas Pharsalia fecit 745  
 a uictis rapiuntur opes.' [nec plura locutus  
 impulit amentes aurique cupidine caecos  
 ire super gladios supraque cadauera patrum  
 et caesos calcare duces.] quae fossa, quis agger

sustineat pretium belli scelerumque petentes? 750  
 scire ruunt, quanta fuerint mercede nocentes.  
 inuenere quidem spoliato plurima mundo  
 bellorum in sumptus congestae pondera massae,  
 sed non impleuit cupientes omnia mentes.  
 quidquid fodit Hiber, quidquid Tagus expulit auri, 755  
 quod legit diues summis Arimaspus harenis,  
 ut rapiant, paruo scelus hoc uenisse putabunt.  
 cum sibi Tarpeias uictor desponderit arces,  
 cum spe Romanae promiserit omnia praedae,  
 decipitur quod castra rapit. capit impia plebes 760  
 caespite patricio somnos, stratumque cubile  
 regibus infandus miles premit, inque parentum  
 inque toris fratrum posuerunt membra nocentes.  
 quos agitat uesana quies, somnique furentes  
 Thessalicam miseris uersant in pectore pugnam. 765  
 inuigilat cunctis saeuum scelus, armaque tota  
 mente agitant, capuloque manus absente mouentur.  
 ingemuisse putem campos, terramque nocentem  
 inspirasse animas, infectumque aera totum  
 manibus et superam Stygia formidine noctem. 770  
 exigit a meritis tristes uictoria poenas,  
 sibilaque et flammas infert sopor. umbra perempti  
 ciuis adest; sua quemque premit terroris imago:  
 ille senum uultus, iuuenum uidet ille figuras,  
 hunc agitant totis fraterna cadauera somnis, 775  
 pectore in hoc pater est, omnes in Caesare manes.  
 haud alios nondum Scythica purgatus in ara  
 Eumenidum uidit uultus Pelopeus Orestes,  
 nec magis attonitos animi sensere tumultus,  
 cum fureret, Pentheus aut, cum desisset, Agaue. 780  
 hunc omnes gladii, quos aut Pharsalia uidit  
 aut ultrix uisura dies stringente senatu,  
 illa nocte premunt, hunc infera monstra flagellant.  
 et quantum poenae misero mens conscia donat,  
 quod Styga, quod manes ingestaque Tartara somnis 785  
 Pompeo uiuente uidet! tamen omnia passo,  
 postquam clara dies Pharsalica damna retexit,





Bistonii uenere lupi tabemque cruentae  
 caedis odorati Pholoen liquere leones.  
 tunc ursae latebras, obsceni tecta domosque  
 deseruere canes, et quidquid nare sagaci  
 aera non sanum motumque cadauere sentit. 830  
 iamque diu uolucres ciuilia castra secutae  
 conueniunt. uos, quae Nilo mutare soletis  
 Threicias hiemes, ad mollem serius Austrum  
 istis, aues. numquam tanto se uulture caelum  
 induit aut plures presserunt aera pinnae. 835  
 omne nemus misit uolucres omnisque cruenta  
 alite sanguineis stillauit roribus arbor.  
 saepe super uultus uictoris et impia signa  
 aut cruor aut alto defluxit ab aethere tabes  
 membraque deiecit iam lassis unguibus ales. 840  
 sic quoque non omnis populus peruenit ad ossa  
 inque feras discerptus abit; non intima curant  
 uiscera nec totas auidae sorbere medullas:  
 degustant artus. Latiae pars maxima turbae  
 fastidita iacet; quam sol nimbiue diesque 845  
 longior Emathiis resolutam miscuit aruis.

Thessalia, infelix, quo tantum crimine, tellus,  
 laesisti superos, ut te tot mortibus unam,  
 tot scelerum fatis premerent? quod sufficit aeuum  
 inmemor ut donet belli tibi damna uetustas? 850  
 quae seges infecta surget non decolor herba?  
 quo non Romanos uiolabis uomere manes?  
 ante nouae uenient acies, scelerique secundo  
 praestabis nondum siccis hoc sanguine campos.  
 omnia maiorum uertamus busta licebit, 855  
 et stantes tumulos et qui radice uetusta  
 effudere suas uictis compagibus urnas,  
 plus cinerum Haemoniae sulcis telluris aratur  
 pluraque ruricolis feriuntur dentibus ossa.  
 nullus ab Emathio religasset litore funem 860  
 nauita, nec terram quisquam mouisset arator,  
 Romani bustum populi, fugerentque coloni  
 umbrarum campos, gregibus dumeta carerent,

nullusque auderet pecori permittere pastor  
uellere surgentem de nostris ossibus herbam, 865  
ac, uelut impatiens hominum uel solis iniqui  
limite uel glacie, nuda atque ignota iaceres,  
si non prima nefas belli sed sola tulisses.  
o superi, liceat terras odisse nocentes.  
quid totum premitis, quid totum absoluitis orbem? 870  
Hesperiae clades et flebilis unda Pachyni  
et Mutina et Leucas pueros fecere Philippos.

## COMMENTARY

---

### 1–6 PRE-DAWN AT PHARSALUS

Daybreak is delayed and the sun is obscured by cloud because it is reluctant to shine on Thessaly on the day of the battle. These lines recall esp. Sen. *Oed.* 1–5 *Iam nocte Titan dubius expulsa redit | et nube maestum squalida exoritur iubar, | lumenque flamma triste luctifica gerens | prospiciet auida peste solatas domos, | stragemque quam nox fecit ostendet dies* and Thy. 784–7 *uerterit currus licet | sibi ipse Titan obuium ducens iter | tenebrisque facinus obruat taetrum nouis | nox missa ab ortu tempore alieno grauis*. Seneca's suns, which are also personified, are similarly hesitant (*dubius*) to shine, or gloomy because they rise over or anticipate scenes of widespread devastation and criminality: cf. also Sen. *Thy.* 120–1, 789–93, *Phaed.* 674–9, *Med.* 28–31. From the human point of view this unnatural darkness is an omen of disaster. The sun's delayed rising further mirrors the narrator's repeated delaying, deferring and obstructing of his poem's progress; its reluctance to illuminate Thessaly may be compared with the narrator's reluctance to tell the key events of his narrative: an unwillingness that is especially acute regarding Caesar's triumphant progress, his victory at Pharsalus and the death of Pompey (Henderson 1987: 133–4; Masters 1992: 3–10, index s.v. 'delay (*mora*) of narrative').

This opening scene also evokes the epic convention of describing dawn (ridiculed at Sen. *Apoc.* 2.3; Austin 1977: 178 on Virg. *A.* 6.535) as well as the narrative strategy common to epic and tragedy of beginning a book or play either at pre-dawn or at daybreak (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 8.1; Virg. *A.* 11.1; tragic examples at Tarrant 1976: 180 on Sen. *Ag.* 53f.). At 1.233–5 the rising sun had wrapped itself in cloud and dimmed its light rather than look upon Caesar's capture of Ariminum (*iamque dies primos belli uisura tumultus | exoritur; sed sponte deum, seu turbidus Auster | impulerat, maestam tenuerunt nubila lucem*): a correspondence that emphasizes the structural link between the first conflict of the war and its climactic battle at Pharsalus.

At 6.828–30 Erictho had ordered the night to delay dawn so that she and Sextus could enter Pompey's camp under a cover of darkness. Readers must therefore decide which authority they privilege for this phenomenon, the sun's own reluctance to shine on Pharsalus (7.6), or its manipulation by an external nefarious power (6.830). If we privilege the latter, it is worth noting that Pompey's blissful and escapist dream both takes place in an unnatural extension of night afforded him by one of the poem's epitomes of evil and happens at the same time that she is entering into his own camp (6.829), which will erupt into a kind of madness at dawn (e.g.

46, 51, 124, 128; cf. Tesoriero 2000: 273 on Luc. 6.828–30). On multiple causation in epic see e.g. Lesky 2001: 170–202; on lines 1–6 see further Housman 1910: 191; Nutting 1932: 54–5; Hübner 1976: 107–16.

**1** ‘Slower than the eternal law was summoning him from Ocean’. **Oceano:** ablative of the starting point (the preposition is omitted more freely in poetry: *NLS* §42 note 2). **lex aeterna:** the law by which the universe operates under the control of the Stoic god, whom they could associate with nature, fate or fortune (Sen. *Ben.* 4.8.3 quoted below, this note). The *lex* summoning the sun at dawn is a metaphor: it is not the agent but one of two ‘instruments’ (with *aether*) of god’s will; cf. Virg. *G.* 1.60–1 *continuo has leges aeternaque foedera certis | imposuit natura locis*; Sen. *Dial.* 1.1.2 ‘this mighty structure of the world does not endure without some one to guard it (*non sine aliquo custode*), and . . . the assembling and the separate flight of the stars above are not due to the workings of chance; . . . this swift revolution of the heavens, being ruled by eternal law (*aeternae legis imperio*), goes on unhindered, producing so many things on land and sea, so many brilliant lights in the sky all shining in fixed array’ (trans. Basore); cf. also *Ep.* 70.14 (on suicide) *nihil melius aeterna lex fecit quam quod unum introitum nobis ad uitam dedit, exitus multos*; both passages anticipate Lucan in going some way to personifying *lex*.

In Lucan such decrees of destiny are variously denoted as *Fatum*, *Fortuna*, *Fors*, or the gods (*dei* or *superi*); this is in keeping with Stoic usage: cf. Sen. *Ben.* 4.8.3 *naturam uoca, fatum, fortunam: omnia eiusdem dei nomina sunt uarie utentis sua potestate*. The concept of fate is given one of its fullest expositions by the narrator at 2.7–11 *siue parens rerum . . . fixit in aeternum causas . . . et saecula iussa ferentem | fatorum immoto diuisit limite mundum*; cf. also 8.568–70 (Pompey might have escaped death) *nisi fatorum leges intente iussu | ordinis aeterni miserae uicinia mortis | damnatum leto traherent ad litora Magnum*. On fate and fortune in *BC* see Pichon 1912: 175, Friedrich 2010: 386–95; Feeney 1991: 280.

**2 luctificus Titan:** the sun (child of Titan Hyperion) is sorrowful (*luctificus* is passive in sense) because it is compelled to illuminate the deplorable events on earth. *luctificus* is a *hapax legomenon* in *BC* and may suggest tragedy: such formations (Lucan has *horrificus*, *pacificus*, *tabificus*, *terrificus*, *ueneficus*, *sacrificus*, *saxificus* and *letificus*) are typical of early Latin tragedy (Horsfall 2000: 226 on *A.* 7.324). Perhaps calqued on πολύστονος (‘much-sighing, mournful’). *luctificus* appears first at Cic. *Carm.* 32.26B *luctifica clades nostro infixa est corpori*, translating Aeschylus or perhaps quoting Accius (Klotz 1953: 254); Pacuvius seems to have used *luctificabilis* (see Pers. 1.78). It is once in Virgil, at *A.* 7.324 (of Allecto), and five times in Senecan drama (cf. esp. Sen. *Oed.* 3, quoted above: 1–6n.). *Titan* for *sol* is first found at Cic. *Arat.* 34.60; it is once in Virgil (*A.* 4.119) and often in

Ovid. Lucan prefers the more prosaic *sol* (× 39) to *Titan* (× 17; cf. Seneca: *Titan* × 17; *sol* × 8).

**2–3** *numquam magis aethera contra | egit equos* ‘never drove his horses harder against the ether’; *numquam magis* modifies *egit* (Housman, Dilke), not *segnior* (ASL), or *luctificus* (Haskins; Postgate). *contra* is postponed: such anastrophe of two-syllable prepositions is common and metrically useful in the sixth foot (cf. 48–9). ‘The ancients believed that the sun’s own motion across the sky was from West to East, but that the sky itself revolved from East to West at a greater rate and so carried the sun with it’ (Duff 1928: 368). The sun is struggling *aethera contra* because it is the *aether*’s revolution which drags the sun with it. Ovid’s *Sol* alludes to the same phenomenon at *Met.* 2.70–3: *adde, quod adsidua rapitur uertigine caelum | sideraque alta trahit celerique uolumine torquet. | nitor in aduersum, nec me, qui cetera, uincit | impetus, et rapido contrarius euehor orbi* (with Hill). The fullest exposition of the sun’s horses is at *Ov. Met.* 2.153–66; they were a favourite poetic, mythological and iconographic subject: see *LIMC* IV.1.594 and IV.2 plates 122–59.

**3** The predominance of dactyls (DSDD) reflects the sun’s galloping horses. **cursumque polo rapiente retorsit** ‘and reversed his course, though the sky was drawing it on’. The reading *currumque* (**Z<sup>2</sup>G**), the sun’s chariot, may well be right (cf. *Virg. A.* 12.485 *currus Iuturna retorsit*; *Sen. Thy.* 784 (of the sun) *uerterit currus*). *cursus* is the trajectory of a heavenly body around its orbit (*OLD* 5b); it is the object of both *rapiente* and *retorsit*: a neat syntactical reflection of the opposing energies described in the sentence. *polus* is here the location of the stars (as at e.g. 5.564; cf. *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.2571.44–2572.12). Its capacity to compel stars to complete their orbits is alluded to at 4.526.

**4–5** *defectusque pati uoluit raptaeque labores | lucis* ‘he wished to suffer eclipses and the deprivation of stolen light’; cf. *Virg. G.* 2.478 [*Musae monstrent*] *defectus solis uarios lunaeque labores*, *A.* 1.742 *solisque labores*. *labor* is often used of diminishing celestial light after its appearance in the *Georgics*, where it means ‘phases’ (Mynors on *G.* 2.478). Lucan’s pairing of *defectus* and *labores* may be more than Virgilian theme and variation: *labor* as the object of *pati* may point to a distinction between the natural event described by *defectus* and the supernatural manipulation of celestial bodies, to which the sun is currently subject (see 1–6n.), and such as that affected upon the moon by magical incantation at 6.499–506, cf. esp. 505 [*Phoebe*] *et patitur tantos cantu depressa labores*.

**5** *attraxit nubes, non pabula flammis*: understand *sibi* with *attraxit* (as one has to at *Sen. Nat.* 5.10.4 *sol . . . alteram partem aeris attrahit, alteram uero impellit*). *pabula* is in apposition to *nubes*. The Stoics thought the sun

was nourished by vapour from the ocean (cf. Cic. *ND* 2.40 = *SVF* 1.504); the concept is alluded to at 1.415-6, 9.313, 10.258-61 (Wick on 9.313 provides a full bibliography).

**6 sed ne Thessalico purus luceret in orbe:** a negative purpose clause; cf. Sen. *Thy.* 786-7 (1-6n.). *purus* 'clear; free from cloud' (*OLD* 6a). *orbe* 'a part of the world' (*OLD* 13a; cf. 5.238): cf. Virg. *A.* 7.224 *uterque | Europae atque Asiae . . . concurrerit orbis*. The use of a personal adjective in place of a genitive is a feature of high poetic style.

### 7-44 POMPEY'S DREAM

This is a celebrated passage ('perhaps the supreme moment of beauty in the *Pharsalia*', Ahl 1976: 178). It was not Lucan's invention but derived from a common account; Livy book 111 was probably an early representative (Rutz 1963: 336; Lintott 1971: 489 n. 4). Versions of it also occur at Plut. *Pomp.* 68.2, *Caes.* 42.1; App. *BCiv.* 2.68.284; Florus 2.13.170 (cf. 22n.); and Obsequens 65a. Plutarch and Appian cite the dedication of the Temple of Venus Victrix in 52 (cf. 9n.) as the main subject matter of the dream; Plutarch, Obsequens and Florus focus on the applause for Pompey from the Roman people. A version of the analysis offered by Lucan at 19-24 (or similar reflections) may also have been part of the tradition: cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 68.1 on conflicting claims of Pompey's encouragement or dejection because of the dream.

Only Plutarch and Appian have adequate detail to compare with Lucan's arrangement. In Plutarch (*Pomp.* 68.1-3) Pompey's camp first moves to the plain of Pharsalus; on 8 August a council of war is forced upon Pompey and collective oaths are taken. The dream occurs that night and Pompey is awoken by the panic in his camp; omens follow. In Appian Pompey capitulates to pressure from his army to fight Caesar on the night of 8 August (*BCiv.* 2.67). Omens and an unsuccessful sacrifice follow. Before the following dawn panic spreads through the camp, which Pompey quells before returning to sleep and having the dream after which he is awoken by friends. In Lucan Pompey has been near Pharsalus since 6.332. Lucan orders events as follows: the dream (7-44); the camp's demand for war and Pompey's capitulation (45-127); the fear in the camp (127-38); omens, including unsuccessful sacrifice (151-84); the mobilization of the camp (214-16). In the other extant accounts the dream follows from the crisis in Pompey's camp as much as it anticipates the battle. In Lucan, the dream completely anticipates Pompey's capitulation to the demands of his camp. The growing crisis is elided to focus on Pompey's psychological state: his nostalgia and his frailty are established; so too his ill-comprehended vision, not of his own victory but of Caesar's

(who would vow his own Temple to Venus Victrix for Pharsalus: App. *BCiv.* 2.68.281). The narrator also foreshadows Pompey's death and predicts Rome's grief before the crisis in the camp is revealed and Pompey yields to the demand for battle. Thus, while the dream is a discrete passage, its influence can be felt when Pompey makes the fatal decision to commit his forces to battle at Pharsalus.

The dream narrative itself (9-12) is only a small part of this passage (7-44). The larger section progresses through nine distinct components: 7-8 segue from the reluctant sunrise sequence to introduce Pompey's dream; 9-12 comprise the actual dream narrative; 13-19 offer a comparison for the dream in a series of composite images from Pompey's three triumphs; 19-24 explore the possible causes of such a dream (19-20 a troubled mind, 21-2 a contrary omen, 23-4 a gift of Fortune); 24-7 contain the narrator's prediction of coming disaster; 28-32 present Rome and Pompey as tragically separated lovers; 33-6 demonstrate the confidence of both Rome and Pompey, based on their shared incapacity to predict that he would never return to Rome; 37-9 present the imagined grief of Rome, had she been able to mourn Magnus openly; 40-4 conclude with a prediction of covert grief for Pompey even while Rome is compelled to celebrate the victory of Caesar. This narrative strategy, in which a plot development is re-presented (as in a simile), reconsidered from various angles or reacted to (especially in the form of apostrophe or impassioned outbursts from the narrator), is typical of Lucan's poetic and narrative technique: see e.g. Roche 2009: 12-13.

Pompey's dream forms something of a prologue to the two-book sequence devoted to his defeat and flight, which will culminate in his death at the end of book 8. The misleading implication of victory for Pompey and the comfort he derives from the vision of Rome offers a devastating counterpoint to his despairing realization of defeat and early flight from Pharsalus. His dream can be understood as vehicle of pathos more generally in its emphasis upon the imminent end of his good fortune, the transience of the *felix uita*, the enumeration of his former honours, and the transparent joy he derives from the vision (cf. Lounsbury 1976: 229 'he is a pathetic figure remembering the favours of a Rome who loves him'; on Lucan and Pathos: Fraenkel 2010).

Pompey's dream is a key passage in his overall characterization in *BC* (see esp. Ahl 1976: 178-82). It reprises from the programmatic simile at 1.129-43 his populist tendencies and his love of approval (in both places illustrated by his theatre: 11-12n.): traits that Lucan's Caesar does not countenance in his lonely pursuit of absolute power. It equates his love for his wife Cornelia with the love he shares with Rome (32n.; cf. 5.794). It illustrates his essentially backward-looking nature in Lucan, again in contrast to Caesar, the harbinger of the principate. It revisits the extravagant

success enjoyed by Pompey prior to the civil war and positions his imminent abandonment by Fortune against his unparalleled ascent, success and tenure of power (cf. e.g. 685–6 (the narrator to Pompey as he flees Pharsalus) *quamque fuit laeto per tres infida triumphos | tam misero Fortuna minor*). The dream sharpens the reader's impression of Pompey's remarkable psychological interiority in a poem whose other dominant heroes occupy ethical positions so extreme as to deter such nuanced explorations of psychology by the narrator. In pursuit of this poetic agenda, the narrator's comparison at 13–19 collapses the chronology of all three of Pompey's historical triumphs (81 BCE: 14n., 71 BCE: 15–19 and 61 BCE: 9n.) into a composite image. This is in keeping with the emphasis upon the totality of Pompey's *felix uita* at line 7 and is not uncharacteristic of the narrator's and Pompey's own tendency in the poem to collectivize his triumphs (e.g. 2.644 (Pompey) '*omnes redeant in castra triumphū*'; 2.727–8 (narrator to Pompey) *lassata triumphis | desciiuit Fortuna tuis*).

Despite the frequent presence of dreams in epic and the *Aeneid* in particular, Lucan has only three (cf. Walde 2001: 436–9). The others are Julia's dream apparition to Pompey at 3.9–35 and the (reported) dream of the victorious Caesarians at 7.760–86. Both of these differ to the present dream in their aim of conveying horror (cf. 3.9 *diri . . . plena horroris imago*; 7.764 *uesana quies, somnique furentes*). The two dreams of Pompey in books 3 and 7 are the only narrated dreams in the poem. They measure the beginning of Pompey's flight from Italy to the eve of the definitive failure of his campaign. Both are of comparable scale and position within their books (3.8–45, 7.7–44), and they share a certain symmetry by which Julia's apparition insistently looks forward while Pompey's vision clings to the past. Pompey emerges from both with renewed or apparently renewed determination to proceed to war (33n.). And both dreams illustrate different aspects of Pompey's disappearing world, in which the encroaching totality of Caesar and Caesarism (3.27) rob him of his present, compromise his future, and leave him only with an increasingly pathetic nostalgia for his former good fortune (Rutz 1963: 344–5). See further Rose 1958: 80–4, Rutz 1963, 334–45, Cancik 1970: 169–73, Ahl 1976: 178–82, Walde 2001: 399–410.

**7 at nox:** for transitional *at* see OLD 2. **felicis:** *felicitas* was a personal attribute, particularly associated with generals; it brought about successful outcomes. Pompey worked hard since at least 66 to associate it with himself as his own personal attribute (and thus paved the way for its adoption among the canon of charismatic imperial virtues; cf. 24n.). It became an important and fiercely contested term in public discourse during the civil war and in its aftermath (Welch 2010: 181–213, 190–5). Pompey's *felicitas* may also foreshadow his dream since he dedicated a shrine to



*Felicitas* within the theatre (9n.; cf. *LTUR* 538). **Magno:** Pompey is referred to by the cognomen *Magnus* about twice as often ( $\times 193$ ) as by his actual name ( $\times 81$ ). Pompey was saluted *Magnus* at the end of 82 or the beginning of 81. The epithet self-consciously evoked Alexander: a connection Pompey encouraged (Sal. *Hist.* 3.88; Plut. *Pomp.* 2). *Magnus* was not his actual cognomen until after 81 (Plut. *Pomp.* 12f.; Plin. *Nat.* 7.96). In Lucan, the name *Magnus* is very frequently used in punning contexts (Feeney 1986b): see e.g. 22n.

**8 sollicitos uana decepit imagine somnos:** a golden line, with adjectives and nouns arranged in chiasmus around the verb (i.e. of the type abVBA; see Wilkinson 1963: 215–17 for an overview). *sollicitos* . . . *somnos* refers to Pompey's ongoing anxiety (20n.) and sets his mood before the reader immediately prior to the dream; a similar narrative tendency occurs in the *Aeneid* with recipients of prophecy (O'Hara 1990: 54). *imago* is used especially of apparitions appearing within dreams (*OLD* 5; *TLL* VII<sup>1</sup>.409.3–21). *uanus* can be used neutrally of apparitions ('insubstantial *uel sim.*' *OLD* 1b), but it also has potentially harder ('full of foolish or empty pride' *OLD* 6b) and more pathetic nuances ('illusory' *OLD* 2a; *fallax*: Horsfall 2003: 392 on Virg. *A.* 11.715). For *decepit imagine somnos* cf. (Ulysses') Agamemnon at Ov. *Met.* 13.216–17 '*ecce Iouis monitu deceptus imagine somni | rex iubet incepti curam dimittere belli*'.

**9 Pompeiani . . . theatri:** the Theatre of Pompey in the lower-central Campus Martius was the first permanent stone theatre in the city and the largest of its time (with a capacity of over 17,000). In every sense a triumphal monument, it was intimately associated with the status of its patron (whose house was adjacent to it), his military victories, and his self-aggrandizing claims. It was begun after Pompey's triple triumph of 61 and inaugurated in 55, the year of Pompey's second consulship (and probably on his birthday, 29 September); the Temple of Venus Victrix which crowned the central axis of the theatre's *cauea* was inaugurated in 52, the year of Pompey's third consulship. At its inauguration in 55, performances of Accius' *Clytaemestra* and the *Equos Troianus* of either Naevius or Livius Andronicus – both lavishly outfitted with spoils from Pompey's own eastern triumph of 61 – reinforced pre-existing associations of Pompey with Agamemnon. The theatre was connected to a large porticus wherein the senate sometimes met (a pointed physical instantiation of Pompey's political pre-eminence) and in which Caesar was assassinated in 44. Both Julius Caesar and Augustus would respond to the implicit claims of the theatre in their own programmes of urban monuments. On the theatre see *LTUR* v.35–8; Coarelli 2007: 283–5. On the inauguration of 55 see Champlin 2003: 295–308; Boyle 2006: 155–6. In this triumphal context

(14n.) *Pompeiani* may hint at *pompa* or *pompeium* (see Plin. *Nat.* 35.140 and 10n. below); cf. Feeney 2010: 354 n. 16.

**9–10 uisus sibi . . . cernere:** Leigh 1997a: 114 n. 1 notes that the phrase cues the reader to a bravura display of ἐνάργεια, a rhetorical figure defined by Quintilian as *uisiones . . . per quas imagines rerum absentium ita repraesentantur animo ut eas cernere oculis ac praesentes habere uideamur* (*Inst.* 6.2.29). *cernere* is often used of mental vision or comprehension, whether in prophecy (e.g. Virg. *A.* 6.87), visions (e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 4.11) or dreams (e.g. Lucr. 4.789): see *TLL* III.873.71–874.52. Leigh 1997a: esp. 10–15 discusses Lucan’s use of ἐνάργεια as a strategy of engaging the emotions of his readers.

**9 theatri:** used here at the beginning of the dream narrative and in the same *sedes* at 44 to conclude the narrator’s reflection upon Pompey’s dream.

**10 innumeram effigiem:** a collective singular (cf. 485 *innumerus . . . missile*). *effigies* often has a special application within the context of apparitions in dreams (e.g. *Culex* 208; Val. Max. 1.7.6). In this triumphal context it may evoke the figures carried before a triumphal procession (Paul. Fest. p. 59 Lindsay and Sil. 17.636). **Romanae . . . plebis:** Pompey’s dream confirms the populist described pejoratively by the narrator in his programmatic introduction at 1.132–3. *plebis* will be answered by 18 *plaudente senatu*.

**11–12 attollique suum laetis ad sidera nomen | uocibus et plausu cuneos certare sonantes:** Pompey’s bliss is undercut by Lucan’s allusion to the deluded populist statesman of Virg. *G.* 2.508–10 *hunc plausus hiantem | per cuneos geminatus enim plebisque patrumque | corripuit*; cf. also Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.7–8 *hunc . . . mobilium turba Quiritium | certat tergeminis tollere honoribus*. These lines continue to adapt the image of Pompey in his theatre at 1.132–3. The inert self-indulgence there of Pompey as one *totus popularibus auris | impelli plausuque sui gaudere theatri* is reworked here to foreshadow his katasterism at 9.18; for Lucan’s language is strongly suggestive of apotheosis, as can be seen from a number of Virgilian contexts: cf. *Ecl.* 9.27–9 *Vare, tuum nomen, . . . | cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cycni*; *A.* 1.259–60 (Jupiter to Venus) ‘*sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli | magnanimum Aenean*’, 12.794–5 (Jupiter to Juno) ‘*indigetem Aenean scis ipsa et scire fateris | deberi caelo fatisque ad sidera tolli*’.

**12 cuneos:** the wedge-shaped sections of seats that radiated outwards through the semicircular *cauea* from a middle point at the front of the stage (see Vit. 6.2 and Sear 2006: 2, 24–36). The *cunei* are used by

metonymy for the audience seated in them (explicit in Virg. *G.* 2.508–10, quoted at 11–12n.).

**13 *qualis erat populi facies clamorque fauentis*** introduces a comparison which strikingly likens a cognitive image to its real-life counterpart.

**14 *iuuenis*:** in contrast to Lucan's emphasis upon Pompey's decline into old age during the civil war (programmatically at 1.129–30 *alter uergentibus annis | in senium*). In epic more generally a *iuuenis* is a hero of fighting age (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.736.1–19); here it denotes the youth of Pompey, who was 24 at the time of his first triumph (Liv. *per.* 89.20 *quattuor et xx annos natus, adhuc eques R., quod nulli contigerat, ex Africa triumphauit*). A Roman could in some contexts be considered a *senex* in his mid-40s (e.g. Cic. *Sen.* 60; Jerome *Chron.* p. 148e Helm): see Parkin 2003: 15–35. ***primique aetate triumphi*:** his first triumph was over 'Africa' (i.e. Marian forces in Africa and their ally King Iarbas of Numidia); it took place on 12 March 81 (Badian 1955). *aetas* is often used with particular force of having attained (or not) the appropriate age for an office or honour (*TLL* I.1131.14–50). It has an edge to it in this context, given Pompey's age. Pompey's three triumphs variously define him in the poem. At 1.121 the narrator claims that Pompey's dominant motivation at the outset of the war is a fear that Caesar's new achievements will displace his former triumphs. Throughout the poem, Pompey's self-definition – in which his triumphs play no small part (e.g. 2.644 *omnes redeant in castra triumphū*) – is balanced against the narrator's assertion that Fortune has been exhausted by his triumphs (2.727–8, quoted at 24n.). At 3.20, Julia claims a causal connection between Pompey's triumphs and his marriage to her, while at 6.422 the narrator claims that Sextus will defile his father's triumphs. The theme of Pompey's triumphs takes on a desperate edge in book 8, as Pompey attempts to regroup in the aftermath of Pharsalus. At 8.230 he claims that he chose not to triumph over Parthia, and at 8.321 that he returned to his greatest triumph from the east. His triumphs naturally feature in his death narrative: at 8.733 their absence is marked from his (non-existent) funeral procession; at 8.813–16 they cap his *res gestae* and underwrite the narrator's claim that no grave could contain such achievements. At 9.598–600 Pompey's three triumphs, along with Marius' triumph over Jugurtha, are used by the narrator as a foil to Cato's march across Libya.

**15–17** 'after he had conquered the nations which the rapid Hiberus encircles and whatever forces elusive Sertorius drove on, with the west pacified'. For Lucan's conflation of Pompey's three triumphs see 7–44n.

**15 *post domitas gentes*:** technical military language (*TLL* V<sup>1</sup>.1946.81–1947.16): cf. Cicero, speaking of Pompey in 56 at *Prov.* 31: *nulla gens est*

*quae non aut ita sublata sit ut uix exstet, aut ita domita ut quiescat, aut ita pacata ut uictoria nostra imperioque laetetur.* For the construction *post* with a noun and a perfect participle see *OLD post*<sup>2</sup> 2b.

**quas torrens ambit Hiberus:** the modern Ebro. The periphrasis in this line underscores the ancient etymology of Hiberia from the Hiberus (Plin. *Nat.* 3.21). The phrase is historiographical in tone: e.g. Sal. *Hist. frag.* 4.77 Maurenbrecher *terra quae ab iis* [i.e. *fluuiis*] *ambitur*; Lucan uses versions of the same at 3.174–5 and 6.51. Cf. also Virg. *A.* 6.550 (*moenia*) *quae rapidus flammis ambit torrentibus amnis*. The adjective *torrens* of rivers (of the Tiber at 2.220 (flooded with blood), of the Nile at 9.156) is common in poetry since Lucr. 4.1100 (with Virg. *A.* 6.550, above, compare *A.* 2.305); it often denotes a river amplified by a sudden influx of rain or melting snow (as at Luc. 6.473 (with *Tesoriero*); Paul. *Fest.* p. 352 Lindsay). At 4.335 the Hiberus is *rapidus*: its size and strength is often noted in Latin authors.

**16 quaecumque fugax Sertorius impulit arma:** *arma* is *exercitus* by metonymy (*TLL* II.600.44–601.44). *fugax* is probably an allusion to the guerrilla tactics adopted by Sertorius and so not pejorative: cf. Virg. *A.* 11.713 (with Horsfall). Quintus Sertorius, a supporter of Cinna, was made praetor of Hispania Citerior in 85, which he took up in 83/2. In 81 he was proscribed by Sulla and expelled from his province but he returned to Spain in the following year and defeated the governor of Hispania Ulterior. He resisted the attempts of several Roman governors to suppress him and by 77 he controlled the majority of Spain. In that year Pompey was given Hispania Citerior following the defeat and death of its governor. Pompey's success in Spain was not as easy as Lucan's lines suggest. Sertorius inflicted a crushing blow on Pompey in 77 and further military setbacks in 75. In 74 Pompey famously wrote to the consuls that if further men, money and supplies were not found, his army and the Spanish war would come to Italy. After Sertorius was assassinated in 71 the remaining resistance was quickly defeated by Pompey, who was then recalled to Italy to assist in the suppression of Spartacus' revolt. For Sertorius see Plut. *Sert.*; Gabba 1976: 103–25; Konrad 1994; Seager 1994: esp. 215–23.

**17 uespere pacato:** a summative phrase, comprising a neat juxtaposition of poetic (*Vespere*) and technical language (*pacato*: *TLL* X<sup>1</sup>.21.20–45; cf. 15n.); it allows the transition from campaigning in Spain back to the triumph in Rome. After the defeat of Sertorius' forces, Pompey erected a trophy in the Pyrenees in which he claimed that he had subdued 876 towns from the Alps to the border of Hispania Ulterior (Plin. *Nat.* 3.18; Strabo 3.4.10, 4.2.1).

**17–18 pura uenerabilis aequae | quam currus ornante toga** 'as revered in the plain white toga as (he was) in the toga adorning his triumphal

chariot'. Note the ellipse of *toga* with *pura*; it must be supplied from the ablative absolute *ornante toga*. The contrast described in this sentence is between Pompey's plain white, i.e. equestrian, toga, and the triumphing (praetorian or consular) general's *toga picta*: a purple toga embroidered with gold detail (see e.g. Oakley 2007: 100–3 on Liv. 10.9.3). A further contrast will have been between Pompey's plain toga and the senatorial togas (these featured a broad purple stripe) worn by those around him in the theatre (cf. 18–19 *senatu* . . . *eques*). *uenerabilis* is a key word in Lucan's presentation of Pompey. It has political (cf. 5.13 *uenerabilis ordo* of the senate) as well as religious nuances; it moreover cues the reader to the theme of Pompey's public esteem in the poem, and its disproportion to both the substance of his own reputation and the existence of other potential objects of veneration (programmatically at 1.135–43, esp. 142–3 *tot circum siluae firmo se robore tollant, | sola tamen colitur*): Feeney 1986b. At 8.317 Pompey chooses to seek support from Parthia precisely because he has always been *uenerabilis* in the east, and as he approaches katasterism the word foregrounds its religious content: 8.664 of his body during the assassination, *decus sacrae uenerabile formae*, 8.855 of Pompey's sacred gravestone; 9.202 of Cato in his eulogy on Pompey, as a *clarum et uenerabile nomen* | *gentibus et multum nostrae quod proderat urbi*.

**18 plaudente senatu:** enclosing the comparison in ring composition with 13 *populi facies clamorque fauentis*, and in pointed contrast (21 *contraria uis*) to the high degree of tension in the camp between Pompey and his senatorial supporters. This is about to become explicit in his exchange with Cicero at 62–123 (cf. esp. 76–7, 84–5). As Dilke notes, the implication in *plaudente* is that they are standing, in contrast to Pompey who sits (19 *sedet*). For the senate in Lucan see Fantham 1999: 109–25.

**19 adhuc Romanus eques:** Pompey would not be of senatorial status until he was elected consul, the summit of regular senatorial ambition, in 70. Pompey's equestrian status is a regular detail from narratives about his first two triumphs (e.g. Cic. *Man.* 62 *quid tam incredibile quam ut iterum eques Romanus ex senatus consulto triumpharet?*; variants of *adhuc Romanus eques* are repeated in this context at Liv. *per.* 89 and Vell. 2.30.2). The phrase *adhuc eques*, which sets before the reader the inversion of Roman social hierarchies whereby the standing senate applaud a seated *eques*, is the crowning paradox of Lucan's comparison and a good illustration of Martindale's (1976: esp. 46–7) contention that paradox, so far from being merely a phenomenon of Lucan's linguistics, resides in the nature of his subject matter.

**19–23 seu . . . siue . . . seu:** Lucan's narrator is often unable to account authoritatively for the causes of natural phenomena, and this lack of

certainty is frequently expressed as a sequence of unresolved multiple or alternative explanations, such as we observe here. Some other examples are: 1.234–5 on eclipses; 1.417–19 on tides; 2.7–15 on omens; 5.86–96 on the Delphic oracle (and cf. 5.131–40: Phemonoe on the silence of the Delphic oracle); 5.244–8 on the cause of the mutiny; 7.197–200 on the basis of Gaius Cornelius' augury. There are (appropriately) a number of explanations for this phenomenon in Lucan. Hardie 2009: 231–63, esp. 249–54, explores the presence of multiple explanations in imperial epic as a Lucretian strategy made popular by Virgil. It is significant for *BC* that the Epicureans favoured multiple explanations as a strategy to avoid ascribing a supernatural cause to phenomena that were otherwise explicable (Hardie 2009: 234). Also relevant is the influence of historiography on Lucan (and epic more generally), wherein an historian's capacity to state the causes or key agents of events is limited by their sources (Tarrant on Virg. *A.* 12.320). Related to this last point is the defective authority of Lucan's inspiring muse, the emperor Nero (1.33–66, esp. 66 *tu satis ad uires Romana in carmina dandas*), whom he invokes in preference to Apollo and Dionysus – an ineffective substitute for the traditional muses: Feeney 1991: 269–85.

**19–20** The first possible explanation of the dream: that in its anxiety, Pompey's mind generated a comforting contemplation of his former greatness. Anxiety dreams were commonly noted and discussed in antiquity (cf. e.g. Lucr. 4.1020–3), although Lucan's essentially escapist response to anxiety separates it from the usually encountered catalogue of dreams representing anxiety-inducing events (e.g. capture and assassination at Lucr. 4.1013–14). The notion of anxiety as a cause of dreams was also well known, and is discussed in the Hippocratic treatise *On Regimen* (4.89). On dreams in antiquity see Harris 2009; on dreams in Greek and Roman poetry, Walde 2001.

**19** *fine bonorum* 'at the end of success' (Braund): used again of Pompey at 8.29 and here picking up 7 *felicis . . . pars ultima uitae*.

**20–4** *mens . . . | uaticinata quies . . . Fortuna*: note the broadening scale of the subjects, which leads from Pompey's own psychological predisposition to the general setting that gives rise to omens and then to *Fortuna*, one of the supreme authorities in Lucan's universe.

**20** *anxia mens curis*: Bentley's correction is preferable to *anxia uenturis* ΩC, since *anxia* does not anywhere else modify *quies*, which must here be supplied awkwardly from 22. *anxia mens* is relatively common (Catul. 68.8; Hor. *Carm.* 3.21.17; Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.10 and 7.3.3; V. Fl. 5.50); for *anxia curis* cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.275. To be beset by cares for one's people is a positive virtue in epic and a stereotype of the good king in Hellenistic kingship

theory: cf. Virg. A. 1.208 (Aeneas) *curisque ingentibus aeger* (Cairns 1989: 1–28, esp. 20; 44), 2.239–41 (Cato) *inuenit insomni uoluentem publica cura | fata uirum casusque urbis cunctisque timentem | securumque sui*. In the present setting of a military camp, Pompey's *anxia mens curis* may recall the more specific role of *cura* in describing the deliberation and *consilium* of a good general (as at Virg. A. 10.159–60 with Harrison; cf. Nisbet 1978–80: 50–61). However, these potentially positive nuances are undercut by the larger delusional, backward-looking and escapist context of the dream (*ad tempora laeta refugit*) and may more readily evoke the solitary despondency of someone at the *felicitis . . . pars ultima uitae*. Pompey is similarly anxious at his withdrawal from Italy at Brundisium: 2.680–1 *Pompeius tellure noua compressa profundum | ora uidens curis animum mordacibus angit*. So too on Lesbos, Cornelia finds him anxious about the impending war and her safety: 5.735–6 *dum fouet amplexu gravidum Cornelia curis | pectus*. **mens . . . refugit:** mirrored in the narrator's own anxiety to narrate Pharsalus at 552 *hanc fuge, mens, partem belli tenebrisque relinque*. **ad tempora laeta refugit:** Pompey's impulse to look back is a general tendency: cf. e.g. 1.134–5, 2.546–9, 2.576–94, 3.1–7 and esp. 7.686–8 *iam pondere fati | deposito securus abis; nunc tempora laeta | respexisse uacat, spes numquam implenda recessit*, where the urge to look back on happy times will undercut somewhat the constancy of soul espoused by the narrator for Pompey in defeat (686–7n.).

**21–2** The second possible explanation of the dream: that it is actually an omen of Pompey's defeat. In some of Plutarch's sources (*Pomp.* 68.1–2), Pompey is anxious that his dream may be prophesying his defeat and that the spoils with which he dreamt he was decorating the Temple of Venus Victrix might prove to be spoils from his defeat rather than his victory. The delusive prophetic dream, particularly the dream that meant the opposite of its apparent content, was a *topos*. Antiphon had already placed emphasis upon precisely this kind of contrary dream in his treatise *On the Interpretation of Dreams* (see Cic. *Div.* 2.144). Cicero records the generally delusive and contrary nature of Pompey's civil war divinations at *Div.* 2.52.

**21 per ambages solitas:** the first of a cluster of divinatory terms (with *uaticinata* and *omina*), *ambages* is used to describe obscure utterances, especially in prophetic contexts: e.g. Virg. A. 6.98–9 *Sibylla | horrendas canit ambages*. Lucan's use of *ambages* to describe a (dream) vision is an easy extension via the compound *uaticinata*, from *canere*. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.51.1 *id Tiberius solitis sibi ambagibus apud senatum incusauit*. **contraria uisis** 'the opposite of what he saw' (Braund; cf. 18n.), the object of 22 *tulit*.



**22 uaticinata quies . . . tulit omina:** *uaticinari* is a *hapax legomenon* in Lucan and rare in poetry outside of Ovid. The combination with *quies* is arresting and paradoxical, in that this ‘quiet’ time ‘sings’ the soothsaying utterances of a *uates*; at Cic. *Sext.* 23 *uaticinari* is coupled with *insanire*. *omina* surprises as the object of *quies fert* or *tulit*; one expects *somnium* (as at [Tib.] 3.4.2). **magni . . . omina plactus:** a pun on Pompey’s name: both ‘omens of great lamentation’ (adjective) as well as ‘omens of Magnus’ lamentation’ (subjective genitive) and ‘omens of the lamentation for Magnus’ (objective genitive). This is a particularly devastating reconfiguration of the *omen/nomen* nexus – to which the reader is quite literally cued in the noun *omina* (see e.g. Pease on Cic. *Div.* 1.102) – in which for so long Pompey’s great destiny was encoded in his name. Postgate *ad loc.* notes the mordent punning in *plactus* (cf. 12 *plausu*, 18 *plaudente*): ‘what was seen (*uisis*) was “a great clapping of the hands,” “*magnus plausus*”; what was signified “a great beating of the breast,” “*magnus plactus*”; cf. Flor. *Epit.* 4.2.45 (Pompey) *in nocturna imagine theatri sui audiens plausum in modum plactus circumsonantem*.

**23–4** The third possible explanation of the dream: that this final vision was the gift of *Fortuna*.

**23 uetito:** dative in agreement with *tibi*. The agent of the prohibition is the same *Fortuna* who bestows the gift. **patrias . . . sedes:** an elevated periphrasis, picking up 9 *sede theatri* and 19 *sedit*. *sedes* is commonly encountered in epic for one’s homeland, where (as here) the emotive dimension of the word is often felt: cf. Virg. *A.* 1.204–6 *per uarios casus, per tot discrimina rerum | tendimus in Latium, sedes ubi fata quietas | ostendunt*. **ultra:** usually of space and measure, *ultra* of time is mainly post-Augustan (*OLD* 2a). **tibi:** the highly emotive climax of the sequence is addressed directly to Pompey; for apostrophe in *BC* see McRoberts 2005; D’Alessandro Behr 2007: 76–112; Roche 2009: 61–4, 112 on Luc. 1.8.

**24 sic:** ‘i.e. in the form of a dream’ (Dilke *ad loc.*). **Romam Fortuna dedit:** a simple, epigrammatic reduction to conclude. In *BC* Pompey is *Fortuna*’s favourite to the extent that at 8.861 the narrator asks whether she lies buried with Pompey after his death (cf. Mayer on 8.860–1). We should view this *Fortuna* as the deity by whose personal good grace he had enjoyed such unparalleled success; she operated in a close nexus with the *felicitas* upon which contemporary sources placed such great emphasis (cf. e.g. Cic. *Man.* 47). Dick 1967: 238–9 noted that in *BC* the concept *fortuna* clusters around Pompey with new-found frequency from this moment in the epic until his death notice at 8.860–1. Book 7 marks the moment of her abandonment of him (cf. esp. 647–9) as foreshadowed at 2.727–8 (the narrator to Pompey) *lassata triumphis | desciiuit Fortuna tuis*.



It is a vehicle of pathos and an element of his tragic characterization that Pompey does not realize his abandonment by *Fortuna* until lines 647–9 and is made to express his trust in her, as at e.g. 2.566–8 (cf. Fantham on 2.727–8): a belief echoed by Cicero at lines 68–73. The essential caprice of *Fortuna*'s benefactions is often made clear to the reader: cf. e.g. 3.290–2 *tot immensae comites missura ruinae* | *exciuit populos et dignas funere Magni* | *exequias Fortuna dedit*, 9.890–1 (of Cato's forces) *uix miseris serum tanto lassata periclo* | *auxilium Fortuna dedit*. **ne rumpite somnos**: the sleep (or insomnia) of the soldier in the midst of enemy territory was a natural *locus* for moralizing: cf. Bacch. frag. 4.75–7 Maehler χαλκεῶν δ' οὐκ ἔστι σαλπίγγων κτύπος, | οὐδὲ συλᾶται μελίφων | ὕπνος ἀπὸ βλεφάρων 'there is no crash of bronze trumpets, nor is honeysweet sleep stripped off the eyelids'; Tib. 1.1.3–4 *quem labor adsiduus uicino terreat hoste*, | *Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent*. Lucan developed the theme at 1.514–18 *cum pressus ab hoste* | *clauditur externis miles Romanus in oris*, | *effugit exiguo nocturna pericula uallo*, | *et subitus rapti munimine caespitis agger* | *praebet securos intra tentoria somnos*. The phrase *rumpere somnos* (first at Virg. A. 7.458 (in the singular) *olli somnum ingens rumpit pauor*) also appears in Julia's apparition to Pompey at 3.25 *dum non securos liceat mihi rumpere somnos* (see 7–44n.) and in describing the retirement of the Pompeians defeated in Spain at 4.394–5 *non proelia fessos* | *ulla uocant, certos non rumpunt classica somnos*.

**25 castrorum uigiles**: if not used loosely ('sentries'), these are the troops who guard the rampart (Oakley 2007: 570–1). They appear in this formulation only at Hirt. *Gall.* 8.35.4 (but cf. Virg. A. 2.335 *portarum uigiles*). The night was divided into four watches of three hours from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. (cf. 5.507 *tertia iam uigiles commouerat hora secundos*); a bugle sounded at the change of each watch and at dawn. Polyb. 6.35–6 and Joseph. *Bj* 3.85–6 provide a detailed account of the system of the night watch in the Roman army camp (see too *RE* suppl. ix.1693–8). **nullas tuba uerberet aures** 'let the bugle's call not strike his ears at all'. *nullus* is used adverbially; it is an emphatic substitution for *ne . . . uerberet* (*OLD nullus* 6). For the topos cf. Tib. 1.1.4 (quoted at 24n.). *uerberare aures* adapts the more usual *pellere* (cf. *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.1018.49–66); it is a rare phrase shared by Lucan and Seneca (*Dial.* 6.19.6 and *Ep.* 56.4).

**26 crastina dira quies et imagine maesta diurna** 'tomorrow's rest, terrifying and gloomy with the image of the day'. *crastina*, *dira* and *maesta* all modify *quies*. The double adjective before the conjunction is unusual in its application to one noun (cf. A–G §323 (d)), but *crastina quies* forms one closely associated unit of sense (cf. 1.655–6). The adjectival pairing of *dira* and *maesta* (only twice in *BC*) is another link to Pompey's vision of Julia (see 7–44n. and 24n.), who appears at 3.9–11 *diri tum plena horroris imago* | *uisa caput maestum per hiantis Iulia terras* | *tollere*. They describe Tartarus

and Acheron respectively at Sen. *Thy.* 15–16. The (unique) phrase *crastina quies* – reworking 22 *uaticinata quies* – comes as a surprise in the pre-dawn twilight, since it jumps ahead of, suggests and puns on the more usually encountered concept of *crastina dies* (e.g. Liv. 3.20; Prop. 2.15.54; cf. Virg. *G.* 1.425–6): *crastina di-* may actually lead the reader to expect this more common phrase. Lucan anticipates the *next* night’s dreaming (*quies, imagine.* 8n.) after and of the battle, but the reader’s expectation will be thwarted by this prediction, since Lucan will report the post-battle nightmare not of Pompey, but of Caesar and his forces, at 760–86: cf. esp. 764 *uesana quies, somnique furentes*. **crastina . . . diurna:** the contrast is enhanced by their position at the beginning and end of the line. For such patterning see Harrison 1991: 289 (d).

**27 undique funestas acies feret, undique bellum:** *funestus* ‘murderous’ (OLD 4a). *funestas acies* (also at 3.312) was a phrase of the declaimer Aurelius Fuscus (Sen. *Contr.* 1.1.6; cf. Ov. *Fast.* 1.521 *funesta . . . arma*; on Lucan and declamation see Bonner 1966). Here it reworks the proem’s programmatic definition of the civil war as 1.4 *cognatas acies* (Sklénář 2003: 17). *funestus* clusters in book 7 (× 7; × 15 in *BC*) and insistently maintains a Pompeian point of view of the battle. *undique bellum* is used only here and at 10.478 of Caesar, besieged in the palace of Ptolemy XIII. For *acies* and *bellum* closely positioned as virtual synonyms for the sake of variety see *TLL* 1.409.53–8.

**28–44** The narrator reflects upon Pompey’s dream, and ruefully contrasts its happy scene with the notion of Rome’s grief for Pompey.

**28** ‘Where can like sleep and happy repose be found for the people?’ There has been an ellipsis of the verb: cf. OLD *unde* 1a, Hor. *S.* 2.5.102 *unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem?* **pares somnos:** echoing *somnos* at 8 and 24. *pares* is basically *aeque felices*. **populis:** ZMP, better than *populi* GU or *populo* V; the plural dative is much more frequent in *BC* than the singular. In *BC* the plural *populi* can variously denote the peoples of Italy who had been given Roman citizenship; the same group with the Romans included; or, as here, primarily the Romans (Housman *ad loc.* and on 1.511). *populis* picks up 10 *Romanae . . . plebis* and 13 *populi facies . . . fauentis* from the dream narrative and comparison; it also anticipates 29 *tua Roma*. **noctemque beatam:** the formulation *nox beata* is found first here, although the adjective had been applied to *dies* since Cicero. *beatus* is a synonym of *felix* (as made explicit in the next line; cf. *TLL* II.1921.61) and echoes the opening line of the dream narrative at 7 *nox felix*.

**29 o felix:** taken with *tua Roma*. The address echoes the opening of the dream narrative at 7 *felix Magno pars ultima uitae*. The emotive exclamation (Lucan uses the interjection *o* × 79 in *BC*; cf. Virg. *A.* × 108) contrasts

with 43 *o miseri*, an antonym of *felix* (TLL vi.450.34), which states plainly the actual condition of the people of Rome, since they are debarred after the civil war from open grief for Pompey. **si te uel sic tua Roma uideret** ‘if even thus your beloved Rome might see you’ (OLD *tuus* 2b): i.e. even in a dream, since Fate has forbidden Pompey’s return (23). Lucan reverses the emphasis upon Pompey’s vision within the dream narrative (9–10 *uisus sibi . . . cernere*).

**30–1 donassent utinam superi patriaeque tibi | unum, Magne, diem:** the detail of the one singular day is pathetic, as at 4.27–8 (when shame delays the engagement of Caesarian and Pompeian forces in Spain) *patriaeque et ruptis legibus unum | donauere diem*.

**30 superi:** for an overview of religion and the gods in Lucan see Liebeschuetz 1979: 140–55, and esp. Feeney 1991: 269–301. **patriaeque tibi:** an emotive juxtaposition. Consecutive *-que . . . -que* at the end of a hexameter line (cf. Homeric τε . . . τε) is one hallmark of an elevated style; it was imported into Latin by Ennius in imitation of Homer (Fordyce on Virg. A. 7.186; Harrison on Virg. A. 10.91).

**31 fati certus uterque** ‘each in full comprehension of destiny’, i.e. knowing Pompey would never return. For the phrase cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.722–3 *futurorum certi, quae cuncta . . . Helenus monitu praedixerat*.

**32 extremum tanti fructum raperetis amoris:** an intensely personal, almost physical, formulation of the shared love of Pompey and Rome: cf. 5.794 (Pompey and Cornelia) *extremusque perit tam longi fructus amoris*; note that *raperet* is frequent in love elegy (cf. 33–6n.). ‘Pompey is, in Lucan’s terms, the lover of Rome as surely as Cato is the city’s father or husband (2.387)’ (Ahl 1976: 181).

**33–6** These four lines are addressed to Pompey but dwell upon the city’s loss of his burial monument. At 33–4 the placement of the pronouns *tu . . . | illa . . .* at the beginning of consecutive lines sharpens the point that neither party foresaw his defeat. At 36 *dilecti . . . Magni* suggests personal affection (cf. 5.473 *dilectus tibi, Magne, socer*) but is also at home in the context of civic esteem (TLL v.1178.26–1179.80); *perdere* also has amatory (TLL x.1262.62–73) as well as civic contexts (TLL x.1273.22–41). Rome’s love of Pompey offers a civilian counterpart to the often amatory language used of Caesar and his soldiers (on which see Leigh 1997a: 204–6; Matthews 2008 on Luc. 5.480–97 and 5.678–99).

**33 tu uelut Ausonia uadis moriturus in urbe** ‘you go forth as if about to die in the Ausonian city’, an ironic echo of 2.74 (Marius) *consul et eversa felix moriturus in urbe*. This line presumably describes Pompey ‘going forth’ from his dream, although it may well suggest his departure from

Rome on 17 January (cf. his departure from Italy at 2.730 *uadis adhuc ingens populis comitantibus exul*). Pompey had emerged from his dream of Julia with a strengthened resolve to enter the war (3.36–45, esp. 36–7 *ille, dei quamvis cladem manesque minentur, | maior in arma ruit certa cum mente malorum*; Rutz 1963: 343; cf. 7–44n.): as Philip Hardie suggests (*per litteras*), ‘there desperation gave him strength, here he does not realize how desperate his situation is’. *Ausonia* . . . *urbe* is an elevated periphrasis for Rome (first at Ov. *Pont.* 3.2.101); *Ausonius* derives from the inhabitants of northern Campania (north of the river Volturnus). In the Hellenistic period it became a synonym for Italy (Horsfall 2000 on Virg. A. 7.623).

**34 illa rati semper de te sibi conscia uoti** ‘she in the knowledge that her prayers for you have always been fulfilled’. *ratus*, a legal term (lit. ‘having legal validity’), is naturally extended to successful prayers since at least Prop. 4.10.14: cf. 9.989 *uotaque turicremos non irrita fudit in ignes*. Later in book 7 (181–2), the frenzied crowd of soldiers will be *uoti* . . . *nefandi* | *conscia* as they hope to kill fathers and brothers in the imminent battle. Dilke suggests that Lucan here alludes to the public prayers for Pompey’s recovery from illness in 50 (cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 57.1 with Leigh 1997a: 121–4). But *semper*, coming so soon after *uadis moriturus in urbe*, is surely (also) evocative of the often-repeated sequence of Pompey’s departure from Rome on campaign followed by his successful return. For the rituals attending a magistrate’s departure from the city on campaign see Oakley on Liv. 10.7.6.

**35 hoc scelus haud umquam fatis haerere putauit:** *haerere* + dat. is regularly found in Ovid and Seneca, but the phrase *fatis haerere* is unparalleled before Lucan. It seems to compress Virg. A. 4.614 *sic fata Iouis poscunt, hic terminus haeret*.

**36 sic se dilecti tumulum quoque perdere Magni:** *quoque* emphasizes *tumulum* (OLD *quoque* 4a): Rome will lose not only the man himself, but even a tomb by which to commemorate him. The hero’s funeral honours and burial are a prominent concern in epic since the *Iliad* (Andronikos 1968; *HE* ‘burial customs’; *VE* s.v. ‘graves and tombs’). Also highly relevant to *BC* is the topography of Rome and its environs. This was transformed by the increasingly elaborate funeral monuments of aristocratic families in the first century BCE. The ultimate expression of this phenomenon was the Mausoleum of Augustus (begun in 29 BCE), a colossal *tumulus* in the northern Campus Martius that would serve as the resting place for the Julio-Claudian dynasty (see Zanker 1988: 5–31, esp. 15–18; Coarelli 2007: 302–4); Virgil may allude to it at A. 6.873–4 *uel quae, Tiberine, uidebis | funera, cum tumulum praeterlabere recentem!*, with Harrison 2006: 159–84, esp. 167–9). In *BC* the presence or absence of such civic memorials and

other monuments is a significant theme: cf. 2.222 (of Sulla) *his meruit tumulum medio sibi tollere Campo?*; 6.810 (the cadaver on the stakes of the war) *quem tumulum Nili, quem Thybridis adluat unda*. The lowly tomb of Pompey and the absence of a memorial to him at Rome naturally dominates his burial and death notice at 8.712–872: cf. esp. 8.713 *Pompeio raptim tumulum fortuna parauit*; 8.816 (on Pompey's exploits) *quis capit haec tumulus?*; at 8.841–50 the narrator wishes to transport Pompey's remains to Rome; at 8.859–72 the rock marking Pompey's resting place is more majestic (cf. 8.861 *augustus!*) than the altars of the victor, an allusion to the Temple of Divus Iulius in the Forum Romanum, which was fronted by a circular altar marking the place of the dictator's cremation; finally, at 8.869–72 the absence of a tomb for Pompey will give way to a happier age which disbelieves his death and which will effectively put Pompey in the same category as Cretan Jupiter.

**37–9** The protasis to this contrary-to-fact conditional is supplied from 30–2, i.e. 'if Rome had had one day knowing that you would not return'. The grieving crowd is separated into men distinguished according to age (37–8), in contrast to an indiscriminate *femineum uulgus* (38–9); for gender dynamics in Roman funerary practices see Šterbenc Erker 2009: 135–60.

**37 mixto . . . luctu:** cf. Virg. A. 10.870–1 *aestuat ingens | uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu* (= A. 12.666–7). Here *miscere* refers to the sharing of mingled grief (cf. Ov. Ep. 5.46 *miscuimus lacrimas maestus uterque suas*).

**37–8 flesset . . . iuuenisque senexque | iniussusque puer:** *flesset* (and 38 *lacerasset*) is a contracted form of the pluperfect subjunctive (again at 6.307). *iniussusque puer* refers to the *puer's* willing, uncompelled display of grief (ASL; Comm. Bern.); cf. Cic. Tusc. 3.64 *pueros uero matres et magistri castigare etiam solent, nec uerbis solum, sed etiam uerberibus, si quid in domestico luctu hilarius ab is factum est aut dictum, plorare cogunt*.

**38–9 lacerasset crine soluto | pectora femineum . . . uulgus:** two common manifestations of female lamentation: cf. e.g. Catul. 64.350–1 *incultum cano soluent a uertice crinem, | putridaque infirmis uariabunt pectora palmis*; Virg. A. 12.870–1 *infelix crinis scindit Iuturna solutos | unguibus ora soror foedans et pectora pugnis*. Within BC cf. 2.22–4 (a grieving Roman mother, a simile of Rome's reaction to Caesar's invasion) *attonitae tacuere domus, cum corpora nondum | conclamata iacent nec mater crine soluto | exigit ad saeuos famularum brachia planctus*.

**39 ceu Bruti funere:** the funeral of L. Iunius Brutus the Liberator was a paradigm of civic grief: Liv. 2.7.4 *sed multo maius morti decus publica fuit maestitia, eo ante omnia insignis quia matronae annum ut parentem*

*eum luxerunt, quod tam acer ultor uiolatae pudicitiae fuisset. ceu* is exclusively poetic until Seneca: *TLL* III.978.1-3, 979.78.

**40-2** Anaphora of *licet* and *dum* marks the escalating emotional register of the passage, as it moves towards its summative apostrophe to the people of Rome at 43-4. Contrast the scene at 9.1104-8, where Caesar's show of grief for Pompey cannot convince those around him to show their true emotions at his death.

**40** *tela licet paueant uictoris iniqui*: grammatically, *licet* + the jussive subjunctive forms an independent sentence, but the effect is a concessive subordinate clause (*NLS* §248) with *flebunt* as the main clause. For Rome's fear of Caesar: 1.479-89, esp. 484-8 *sic quisque pauendo | dat uires famae, nulloque auctore malorum | quae finxere timent. nec solum uulgus inani | percutsum terrore pauet, sed curia et ipsi | sedibus exiluire patres*, 3.80-3, and Caesar's reaction at 3.82-3 *gaudet tamen esse timori | tam magno populis et se non mallet amari*; at 5.381 Rome is *trepidans* as Caesar enters it. The concern in this post-victory context is whether or not punishment will be meted out to Caesar's civil war opponents; Cic. *Marc.* provides a contemporary index of this concern (cf. e.g. 17 *uidimus tuam uictoriam proeliorum exitu terminatam: gladium uagina uacuum in urbe non uidimus*). At 9.139 Gnaeus Pompeius reiterates the narrator's assessment of Caesar as *uictor iniquus*; here the adjective may be predicative and potential: i.e. they may fear that the victor *may prove himself to be unjust*.

**41** *nuntiet ipse licet . . . tua funera, flebunt*: *funera* 'death', poetic plural for singular. (*OLD* 3a); cf. 9.106-7 [*anima*] *potuit cernens tua funera, Magne, | non fugere in mortem. flebunt* picks up 37 *flesset*.

**42** *sed dum tura ferunt, dum laurea sarta Tonanti*: Lucan returns to triumphal imagery, but now changes focus from Pompey's past triumphs (13-19) to Caesar's future triumphs, which will mark the defeat and death of Pompey. Dilke notes that the language here is applicable either to a *supplicatio*, in which an offering of wine and incense (*tura*) was made (in this case for victorious return from a war), or to a triumph, wherein both the *triumphator* and his soldiers were bedecked in laurel (*laurea sarta*). Cic. *Phil.* 14.23 seems to indicate a *supplicatio* after the Alexandrian war (*ad te ipsum, P. Servili, num misit ulla conlega litteras de illa calamitosis-sima pugna Pharsalia? num te de supplicatione uoluit referre? Profecto noluit. At misit postea de Alexandria, de Pharnace*). Caesar celebrated four triumphs from 20 September to 1 October 46, nominally over foreign enemies (Gaul, Egypt, Pharnaces and Juba: the official line is explicit at Cic. *Phil.* 14.23), but including images of the defeat of his citizen enemies (Pompey excluded) in the *pompa* (43n.), including Scipio, Petreius and Cato: Plut. *Caes.* 55.2; Suet. *Jul.* 37; App. *BCiv.* 2.101; Cass. Dio 43.19. Incense

bearers were a part of the *pompa* of the triumph (cf. 2 Corinthians 2.14–16; Maxfield 1981: 101–9). Laurel wreaths crowned victorious generals in the triumph, which culminated at the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, to whom Caesar had prayed at 1.195–6: *magnae qui moenia prospicis urbis* | *Tarpeia de rupe Tonans*; cf. 6.260–1 *non tu bellorum spoliis ornare Tonantis* | *templa potes, non tu laetis ululare triumphis*; Ingleheart 2010 on *laurea sarta* at Ov. *Tr.* 2.172.

**43 o miseri:** cf. the *matronae* of 2.38–42 who can express their grief only for as long as the outcome of the war remains in doubt and who will be coerced into public joy for the victor. **quorum gemitus texere dolorem** ‘whose groans concealed their grief’, i.e. did not display it: their mourning took place in private. The text is uncertain (*edere* GVC; *sedere* ZM, P (corrected from *sedem* \*\*); *odere* U) and *edere* ‘consumed’ cannot take *dolorem* as its object to mean ‘used up’ or ‘swallowed down’. This edition prints a conjecture first noted (but rejected) by Franken. Shackleton Bailey 1982: 96 notes that the paradox of groans concealing grief rather than making it known would be characteristic. It is possible that this phrase evokes a detail from Caesar’s triumph: App. *BCiv.* 2.101.419–20 ‘... all these [civil war] misfortunes were represented in the processions and the men also by various images and pictures, all except Pompey, whom alone he did not venture to exhibit, since he was still greatly regretted by all. The people, although restrained by fear, *groaned over their domestic ills* (ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς οἰκείοις κακοῖς, καίπερ δεδιώς, ἔστανε), especially when they saw the picture of Lucius Scipio, the general-in-chief, wounded in the breast by his own hand, casting himself into the sea, and Petreius committing self-destruction at the banquet, and Cato torn apart by himself like a wild beast.’

**44 qui te non pleno pariter plangere theatro:** closure is marked by alliteration and ring composition (*theatro*, cf. 9 *theatri*). Serv. on Virg. *A.* 11.211 states that *plangere* denotes words as well as gestures such as beating of the breast and face.

#### 45–61 POMPEY’S CAMP DEMANDS BATTLE

A number of historical sources record the tension in Pompey’s camp; this had increased after his success at Dyrrachium in January 48. It arose from Pompey’s ongoing strategy of avoiding battle and disrupting Caesar’s lines of supply and it ultimately precipitated the Battle of Pharsalus. Caesar reports (*Civ.* 3.86) that Pompey engaged him *suorum omnium hortatu*; Plutarch (*Pomp.* 67.2–3, *Caes.* 41.1–2) and Appian (*BCiv.* 2.67) provide further details (52–5n.): Pompey’s cavalry thought that their general would need to be deposed after Caesar was defeated; according to Plutarch’s sources, Pompey did not bring Cato to Pharsalus but left him



on the coast for fear that Cato would attempt to depose him after a victory (cf. Lucan's Cato at 2.320–3). Pompey was accused of dragging out his command to prolong his tenure of power and the submission of his peers, contemporaries, Roman generals and allied kings. This was the point of various insults directed at him, notably that of Domitius Ahenobarbus, who now began calling him 'Agamemnon' and 'king of kings' (and thus cast in his teeth an association Pompey had earlier worked to foster: gn.).

Lucan reworks this six-month process into a scene of sudden, collective madness on 9 August. Camp politics are only obliquely present: at 52–7 the camp's complaint is reworked from accusations in the historical sources. Greater emphasis is accorded to fate, madness, the irony of demanding one's own death and the poem's inscrutable theodicy to which the narrator is opposed (45–52, 58–61). The camp's madness is compelled by the destructive trajectory of fate (46), escalates from initial signs of unrest (45–6, 49) and grows despite the assured doom of the camp (48, 50) to a *dira rabies* prompting the camp's demand for its own individual and collective destruction (51–2).

The ultimate (but by no means direct) epic antecedent for this scene is Hom. *Od.* 12.260–373: Odysseus' men mutiny in order to land on the Island of Helios despite his instructions to avoid the island as pernicious. They subsequently contravene his orders and eat the cattle of Helios. Both Homer and Lucan preserve the pattern whereby destruction engineered by divine authority awaits the mutineers, while the leader escapes the ensuing catastrophe. Leigh 1997a: 116 also locates Pompey within the Livian tradition of 'an experienced general who wisely delays engagement with the enemy but who is driven to precipitate and often disastrous action by the impatience of his subordinates and common soldiers'. Examples include Camillus, who averted near-disaster at Satricum (Liv. 6.23–4), and the dictator C. Sulpicius, who narrowly avoided defeats against the Gauls (Liv. 7.12.9–15.8). This tradition will offer a point of comparison for Pompey's decision to flee battle (see 647–97n.).

In Lucan, this is the second of three scenes – one for each for his heroes – in which a leader's authority is challenged. At 5.237–373 Caesar's troops mutiny at Placentia in order to retire from the war; at 9.217–93 Cato's troops mutiny in Libya in order to lay down arms after the death of Pompey. All three mutiny narratives present the motives of the soldiers and a speech in response by their general. There is an especially pointed contrast with the mutiny at Placentia, afforded by the narrator's impassioned prayer which concludes both sequences (5.297–9; cf. 58–61): the approving tone of 5.297–9 – *sic eat, o superi: quando pietasque fidesque | destitunt moresque malos sperare relictum est, | finem civili faciat discordia bello* – is completely transformed into the shattered disbelief of lines 58–61. This is the only collective challenge to a leader's authority within the poem in



which the leader concedes to the wishes of his subordinates. Neither the *fortuna* of Caesar (5.302) nor the idealism of Cato (9.256–8, 9.265) will permit such an outcome; both the speeches of Caesar and Cato, in which they variously cower their subordinates back into submission, stand in contrast to Pompey's ready capitulation.

Lounsbury 1976 argued that Lucan's aim in the present scene is to exonerate optimate senators within Pompey's camp from responsibility for precipitating the defeat at Pharsalus. He suggested that this was part of a larger agenda stemming from Lucan's politics in the mid-60s. Certainly Lounsbury is correct to note Lucan's displacement of discontent onto an anonymous collective from those named senators within Pompey's camp whose frustrations and disputes are on record: we know of Domitius Ahenobarbus, Favonius, L. Afranius (Plut. *Pomp.* 67.2–3, *Caes.* 41.1–2), Metellus Scipio, Lentulus Spinther (Caes. *Civ.* 3.83) and L. Lentulus Crus (Cic. *Att.* 11.6.6). But as Leigh 1997a countered, this process of exclusion has to be weighed in the balance with the inclusive first person of the prayer at 58–61. So far from limiting the guilt from Pharsalus, Lucan removes any boundaries to it at all, to encompass the camp, himself and potentially his contemporary audience as well: for Lucan, Pharsalus brought universal guilt (cf. 1.6 *in commune nefas*). On lines 45–61 see Lounsbury 1976: 210–13; Quint 1993: 148; Leigh 1997a: 146–7.

**45 uicerat astra iubar** 'The first light of dawn had conquered the stars'. Dawn at last, whose first hint was at 6.828 (see 1–6n.). Lucan's three-word description is unusually brief. *iubar* commonly occurs in poetic descriptions of the rising sun (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.572.30–50), as at 5.455–6.

**45–6 cum mixto murmure turba | castrorum fremuit** revisits the unrest in Caesar's camp at 1.352–3 *at dubium non claro murmure uulgus | secum incerta fremit*. There, however, the soldiers' indignant muttering is an expression of their reluctance to go to war, and it is immediately overcome. Here, it will continue to intensify until Pompey is compelled to war (as at 114 *pugnatur*). *mixto murmure turba* corresponds to *mixto luctu* and *uulgus* in the contrary-to-fact scene of grief just described at 37–9. Cf. also Virgil's winds as agents of disorder at *A.* 1.55–6 *illi indignantes magno cum murmure montis | circum claustra fremunt*. For *fremere* of human grumbling see *OLD* 2a; *TLL* VI.1282.48–1283.3.

**46 fatisque trahentibus orbem:** cf. 2.287 (Cato) *sed quo fata trahunt uirtus secura sequetur* (on *fatum* see 1n.). The coupling of *fata* as subject of *trahere* is common (e.g. Virg. *A.* 5.709–10) and points to a Stoic conception of predetermination: see e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 107.11.5 (translating Cleanthes) *ducunt uolentem fata, nolentem trahunt*.

**47 signa petit pugnae:** this compressed clause makes explicit both the nature of the camp's murmurings and the workings of fate.

**47–8 miseri pars maxima uulgi | non totum uisura diem:** as Pompey justifies to himself his flight from Pharsalus, Lucan revisits the same phraseology and the same theme of the casualties of the multitude at 656–8 *ut Latiae post se uiuat pars maxima turbae, | sustinuit dignos etiam nunc credere uotis | caelicolas, fouitque sui solacia casus*. It bodes poorly for Pompey's troops that the other *miserum uulgi* in the poem is comprised of the victims of Sulla's mass execution at 2.208–9 (*miseri tot milia uulgi | non timuit iussisse mori*). As part of the compressed style favoured by Lucan a future participle (*uisura*) will frequently replace a relative clause (Roche 2009: 57).

**48–9 tentoria circum | ipsa ducis:** for the anastrophe of *circum* cf. 2–3n. on *contra*. *tentoria . . . ducis* is a periphrasis for *praetorium*, the commanding officer's tent. It was situated in the middle of the camp: its position was decided first (Polyb. 6.27.1) and determined (with the main gate) the overall layout of the camp. The *praetorium* was a sacred place; it contained a shrine for the standards as well as the legionary treasury: Helgeland 1978: 1491.

**49 magnoque accensa tumultu** 'their passions roused by the great uproar': a rapid escalation in intensity and sound from 45–6. The camp's present volatility sits in contrast to its self-control at Dyrrachium: 6.11–12 (Caesar) *ut uidet ad nullos exciri posse tumultus | in pugnam generum. accendere* is often used of demagoguery (e.g. Sal. Jug. 34.1 *multitudo, quae in conitione aderat, uehementer accensa*), here the camp works itself up into frenzy.

**50 mortis uicinae properantes admouet horas** 'and bring on hastening hours of imminent death' (Braund): an expansive take on the motif of the *hora mortis* (TLL VI.2963.30–50). Elsewhere in the poem, the same motif frequently applies to universal cataclysm: e.g. 1.73 *saecula tot mundi suprema coegerit hora*, 6.6 (Caesar) *funestam mundo uotis petit omnibus horam*, 6.415–6 *summique grauem discriminis horam | aduentare palam est, propius iam fata moueri*.

**51 dira subit rabies:** *rabies* – 'a strong word that suggests animal savagery' (N–R on Hor. *Carm.* 3.24.26) – is  $\times 20$  in *BC* (cf. Virg. *A.*:  $\times 7$ ; Ov. *Met.*:  $\times 9$ ) and  $\times 5$  in book 7, where it is exclusively Caesarian: cf. 245 (Caesar's) *in ferrum rabies promptissima*, 474 the *praeceps rabies* of Crastinus casting the first weapon, 551 and 557 Caesar's *rabies* at the centre of battle. For *dirus* of mad or self-destructive desire see e.g. Virg. *A.* 2.519–20 (Hecuba to Priam) *quae mens tam dira . . . | impulit?* On *rabies* in book 7 see Lapidge 1979: 369–70.

**51–2 sua quisque ac publica fata | praecipitare cupit** ‘each man desires to hurry on his own destiny and that of the state’. For Lucan’s readers *fata* will also strongly connote ‘death’ (*OLD* 6a and b); cf. App. *BCiv.* 2.67.279 ‘he prepared for battle . . . to his own hurt and that of the men who had persuaded him’. For the expression cf. Cic. *Brut.* 328 *sic Q. Hortensi uox exstincta fato suo est, nostra publico*. For civil war as suicide in *BC* cf. 1.2–3 *populumque potentem | in sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra*; for suicide in Lucan see Hill 2004: 213–36. *praeceps* and *praecipitare* often describe the headlong rush to destruction in *BC* (e.g. 4.267–8 *conuersus in iram | praecipitem timor est*; 5.692–4 *sors ultima rerum | in dubios casus et prona pericula morti | praecipitare solet*).

**52 segnis pauidusque uocatur**: not present in the historical sources as accusations from his soldiers, but Appian editorializes that by now Pompey had become ‘sluggish and dilatory (νωθής τε ἄρ καὶ βραδύς) in all things’ (*BCiv.* 2.67).

**52–5** Cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 67.2 ‘charges were rife that he was directing his campaign, not against Caesar, but against his country and the senate, in order that he might always be in office and never cease to have for his attendants and guards men who claimed to rule the world’ (trans. Perrin). App. *BCiv.* 2.67.278–9 records accusations of Pompey ‘being fond of power (ἐς φιλαρχίαν) and of delaying purposely in order to prolong his authority over so many men of his own rank’. For Pompey’s ‘world-rule’ (owing to foreign nations and kings in his forces) see 3.169–70 *totum Magni fortuna per orbem | secum casuras in proelia mouerat urbes* and 3.297 (sc. *Caesari*) *uincendum pariter Pharsalia praestitit orbem*.

**53 ac nimium patiens soceri** ‘and too tolerant of his father-in-law’. For *nimis* and *patiens* cf. Cic. *de Orat.* 2.305, *Phil.* 10.23; Hor. *Ars* 271 (*patienter*); Ov. *Pont.* 4.10.9; Apul. *Apol.* 35. For the Romans too much *patientia* was a bad thing: see Kaster 2002. *socer*, emotively juxtaposed with *Pompeius*, insinuates a conflict of interest for Pompey as Caesar’s former son-in-law. The ‘family connection’, one of the reasons that the war was regarded with such horror, is insistently drawn throughout *BC* (*socer* for Caesar × 33, *gener* for Pompey × 24): it is one basis of the claim that the poem’s *bella* were *plus quam ciuilia* (Roche on Luc. 1.1).

**53–4 et orbis | indulgens regno** ‘indulging in tyranny over the world’ (*OLD* *indulgeo* 4). For the phrase cf. 2.321 (Cato on Pompey) *hunc quoque totius sibi ius promittere mundi. regnum* (× 90 in *BC*) is here emotional and pejorative (L–S I.B.2). *indulgens regno*, uniquely collocated here, pairs tyranny with a verb regularly used to describe a personal release of self-control (esp. regarding emotions or wine).

**54–5 qui tot simul undique gentes | iuris habere sui uellet pacemque timeret** ‘because he wished to have so many nations from everywhere under his authority at the same time and he feared peace’: a causal relative clause. *uocatur* (52) is historic present, hence imperfect subjunctives (NLS §142). The viewpoint is that of the accusers, not the narrator (G–L 628). *iuris habere sui* (genitive of description, more often with *esse* or *facere*: TLL VII<sup>2</sup>.694.80–695.40; cf. G–L 365–6) recasts *orbis . . . regno* (53–4) into prosaic language typical of legal or military authority (e.g. Vell. 2.69.2 *C. Cassius . . . decem legiones . . . sui iuris fecerat*). For *pacemque timeret* cf. Cic. *Fam.* 7.3.2 (before Pharsalus) *coepi suadere pacem, cuius fueram semper auctor; deinde, cum ab ea sententia Pompeius ualde abhorreret, suadere institui ut bellum duceret*. For Pompey in *BC*, though, the accusation is baseless: 1.130–1 (the narrator on Pompey) *longoque togae tranquillior usu | dedidit iam pace ducem*, 1.311 (Caesar on Pompey) *longa dux pace solutus*, 2.558–9 (Pompey on himself and his troops) ‘*disces non esse ad bella fugaces | qui pacem potuere pati*’, 9.199 (Cato on Pompey) ‘*pacem armatus amauit*’. Contrast Caesar at 2.650 *numquam patiens pacis*.

**56 nec non et reges populique queruntur Eoi**: the eastern kings in Pompey’s forces led Ahenobarbus to call him ‘Agamemnon’ and ‘king of kings’ (cf. 45–61n.). *nec non et* is poetic (e.g. Virg. *A.* 1.707 with Serv.), as is *Eoi* (e.g. Virg. *A.* 6.831 (Pompey) *gener aduersis instructus Eois*): the length of its first syllable varies in Lucan (long at 442, 742; short here, 423; see SB 294), in Latin in general (*OLD*), and in Greek (ἠῶος or ἑῶος). For the kings and nations under Pompey’s command see 3.169–297 (with Hunink), 5.49–64 and cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.3–4.

**57 bella trahi patriaue procul tellure teneri**: supply *se* as the subject of *teneri*; *tellure* is ablative of separation. Alliteration adds emphasis to these accusations, for which see Plut. *Pomp.* 67.2 and App. *BCiv.* 2.67.278–9 (52–5n.). *bella trahi* ‘that the war is being drawn out’: cf. 296 Caesar begs the soldiers’ pardon for delaying war with his battle exhortation. *bellum trahere* is common in historiography (e.g. Liv. 7.12.12) and rare in poetry. *patriaue procul tellure teneri* is suggestive of exile; *patria tellus* is emotive (e.g. Sen. *Tro.* 602 *patria tellus Hectorem leuiter premat*).

**58 hoc placet, o superi**: an abrupt interruption from the narrator, expressing stunned disbelief. It is echoed at 87 (‘*si placet hoc*’) as Pompey’s opening statement in reply to Cicero and reprised at the beginning of the narrator’s lamentation over Pompey’s grave: 8.793–4 *placet hoc, Fortuna, sepulchrum | dicere Pompei . . .* ? The frequency of the appeal *o superi* (cf. 5.297–9; see 45–61n.) reflects the heightened emotional register of *BC* (× 11; cf. Virg. *A.* × 1; Ov. *Met.* × 3).

**58–9 cum uobis uertere cuncta | propositum** ‘when it is your purpose to ruin everything’, *uertere* is used for *euertere*, simple for compound: cf. Virg. A. 2.652–3 *ne uertere secum | cuncta pater . . . uellet*, which supports the reading *uertere* **ZG** over the banal *perdere cuncta* **PUV, M** (in erasure). *propositum* (est) + dat. is formal: cf. Cic. *Cluent.* 30 *non mihi hoc esse propositum ut accusem Oppianicum mortuum* (cf. *TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.2066.5–25).

**59 nostris erroribus addere crimen** ‘to add crime to our mistakes’; cf. Cic. *Marc.* 13 (on those who fought in the civil war) *etsi aliqua culpa tenemur erroris humani, ab scelere certe liberati sumus*. The opposition between mistakes and deliberate wrongdoing is traditional; cf. Ovid on his exile (e.g. *Pont.* 3.3.65–76). Lines 60–1 will contextualize and explain this phrase. The *crimen* is to demand and pray for battle at Pharsalus (cf. 60–1 *poscimus, uotum est*). Glaesser 1984: 122 suggests that *nostris erroribus* evokes a tragic ἀμαρτία ‘error’ (Arist. *Poet.* 1453a8–10), and that the *error* (plural for singular) is to fail to recognize the nature of civil war and so abstain from the fighting.

**60 cladibus irruimus nocituraque poscimus arma:** heroic and desperate at Virg. A. 2.383 *irruimus densis et circumfundimur armis*. For (*in*)ruere in the context of civil war cf. Hor. *Epod.* 7.1 *quo quo scelesti ruitis?* (with Watson *ad loc.*: ‘describes actions which are precipitate, impetuous and ill-considered’). The disastrous outcome of the civil war is frequently described in the poem as a *clades* (e.g. 1.30–1 *nec tantis cladibus auctor | Poenus erit*). For *nocituraque poscimus arma* (47–8n.) cf. Juno’s final instruction to Allecto at Virg. A. 7.340 *arma uelit poscatque*.

**61 in Pompeianis uotum est Pharsalia castris** ‘in the Pompeian camp Pharsalus is their prayer’ (see *OLD* *uotum* 3c): cf. 251–2 (Caesar) ‘*miles, adest totiens optatae copia pugnae. | nil opus est uotis*’, 2.533 (Pompey to his troops) ‘*uotis deposcite pugnam*’. The naming of the battle underscores the irony whereby the Pompeians unwittingly pray for the climactic battle that Lucan’s readers know as the catastrophic defeat of the war (as though *uotum est* ‘*Pharsalia*’). Lucan’s use of *sententiae* was a defining characteristic of his style (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90). For Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1394a, γνῶμαι ‘maxims’) they were general truisms, but declamation expanded the scope of *sententiae* to include brief and often summative or terminal comments which (as here) might deploy paradox or antithesis, but which might not have general applicability; see Bonner 1966: 260–9.

## 62–85 CICERO’S SPEECH

Cicero was not at Pharsalus (Cic. *Fam.* 9.18.2; Plut. *Cato* 55.1–3, *Cic.* 39.1), but remained at Dyrrachium with other Pompeians, such as Cato and

Varro; Lucan no doubt knew this (e.g. from Livy: cf. *per.* 111 *Cicero in castris* [*sc.* at Dyrrachium] *remansit, uir nihil minus quam ad bella natus*; *Cic. Div.* 1.68; and perhaps from Cicero's correspondence: Malcovati 1953; Holliday 1969: 84–92). As a symbol of the constitutional authority of the senate (63–4), Lucan's Cicero dramatizes Pompey's obligations to a political community, as opposed to the autocracy of Caesar (Ahl 1976: 160). The effect of his speech is to broaden the focus in the historical tradition on Pompey's personal shortcomings: his capitulation to pressure and his diminishing capacity for leadership before Pharsalus (App. *BCiv.* 2.67.276–9; Plut. *Pomp.* 67.7). These are present in *BC*, but Lucan also emphasizes the dilemma of Pompey's position as the senate's appointed leader. Lines 62–85 widen the scope of responsibility for Pharsalus without exonerating Pompey (*pace* Narducci 2003: 81–3). Lucan's Cicero is also a symbol of the mastery of eloquence (62–3), which is used to bolster a weak case (67): the bases of his argument are so unsound (esp. 76–7) as to be tragically ironic (Narducci 2003: 84). Also compromising is Cicero's role as an advisor to war, previously played by Curio at 1.273–91 (65–6n.). Contrast Cicero's own claims (*Fam.* 7.3.2–3) that when he arrived at Pompey's camp in Greece in May he despaired of victory (*nihil boni nisi causam*, *Fam.* 7.3.2; cf. Plut. *Cic.* 38.2), that he advised Pompey to broker a peace with Caesar and that, when this was rejected by Pompey, he advised him to protract the war (54–5n.).

Narducci (2003: 81–3) sees Cicero's introduction (esp. 63–4) as demonstrating the exercise of violence as a manifestation of legitimate power. It is excessive to attribute to Lucan's Cicero the 'blind and arrogant confidence' that Cicero deplored in Pompey's camp (*Fam.* 7.3.2), but Narducci is correct that lines 62–85 undermine Cicero's repeated emphasis upon the superiority of the civilian magistrate over holders of military *imperium* and corrode the opposition between Pompey as 'war-lord' and Cicero as 'architect of peace' (as at *Fam.* 7.3.2): Lucan's Cicero, just as his Pompey, is a tool of fate (Friedrich 2010: 394). See further Malcovati 1953; Ahl 1976: 160–4; Johnson 1987: 76–8; Narducci 2003: 78–91.

**62–3 cunctorum uoces Romani maximus auctor | Tullius eloquii:** a stately line (spondees until the fifth foot) to introduce Cicero, whose name is enjambed in the next line. *cunctorum uoces* is the object phrase, the subject phrase is *Romani maximus auctor | Tullius eloquii*; the verb is delayed until 65 *pertulit*. *cunctorum uoces* means he will represent the complaint of the general camp (71) as well as of the eastern kings (73). Cf. Cicero's own description of various *auctores* ('expert, model, authority' OLD 8), e.g. *Orat.* 10 *dicendi grauissimus auctor et magister Plato*.

**63 cuius sub iure togaque** ‘under whose civilian authority’ (Braund), probably a reworking of Cicero’s *De consulatu suo* frag. 12 Courtney *cedant arma togae* (Narducci 2003: 83–4); cf. Corn. Sev. frag. 219.14–15 Hollis (Cicero) *legum ritusque togaeque | publica uox* (with Hollis). Lucan’s hendiadys for civil jurisdiction gains point from similar paired metonymies which underscore *both* military *and* civil spheres of service: e.g. Ov. *Met.* 15.746 (Caesar) *Marte togaque, Pont.* 2.1.61 (Germanicus) *belloque togaque*.

**64 pacificas saeuus tremuit Catilina secures:** a golden line (8n.). The oxymoron *pacificas . . . secures* is unique, and *pacificus* itself is rare (× 2 in *BC*); one might rather have expected *saeuas secures*, as at Lucr. 3.996 and Virg. *A.* 6.819–20. *secures* are the executioner’s axe carried in the fasces, the visible symbol of Cicero’s constitutional authority as consul in 63 (*OLD* 2b; *OCD* s.v. ‘fasces’; cf. Virg. *A.* 6.819–20 (Brutus) *consulis imperium hic primus saeuasque secures | accipiet*). His execution without trial of the conspirators in 63 was of questionable legality and was later exploited by his enemies (see e.g. Levick 2015: 79–83, 94–6). *saeuus* is used frequently of agents of implacable fury or cruelty in the *Aeneid* (Craca in *EV* iv.644), and so too in *BC*: 4.1–2 (Caesar), 8.667–8 (Septimius).

**65 pertulit** ‘he delivered’, i.e. to Pompey (*OLD* 2a, of messages and reports); regular epic usage, as at Virg. *A.* 11.825 *haec Turno mandata nouissima perfer*). **iratus bellis** is a neat, almost comical, paradox to express Cicero’s pacifism (cf. 63 *sub iure togaque*, 64 *pacificas . . . securis*). Epic *ira* or ἰρῆνις ‘rage’ normally results from battle, not from impatience at war itself: Cicero is a long way from e.g. Aeneas at Virg. *A.* 2.316–17 *furor iraque mentem | praecipitat, pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis*.

**65–6 cum rostra forumque | optaret:** causal. *rostra forumque* are metonymies for Cicero’s civic function as orator and statesman; the rostra were the platform in the forum from which the people were addressed. The phrase revisits 63 *sub iure togaque*, but also forges a connection with Lucan’s Curio (cf. 62–85n.), with whom the rostra and forum are associated at 4.799 *quid nunc rostra tibi prosunt turbata forumque?* They were also paired in association with Cicero’s proscription in declamation (Sen. *Suas.* 6.19, *Contr.* 7.2.2 *respice forum: hic sub Cicerone sedisti; respice rostra: hic supra Ciceronem stetisti. quantum eloquentia tua, Cicero, potuit!*); cf. also Corn. Sev. frag. 219.1–2 Hollis *oraeque magnanimum spirantia paene uirorum | in rostris iacuerunt suis, sed enim abstulit omnis* (see Hollis 2007: 358–60).

**66 passus tam longa silentia miles:** *passus* points to a contrast between Cicero’s impatience and Pompey’s continuing tolerance at 53 *nimum patiens soceri*. The phrase alludes to Cicero’s withholding his opinion in Pompey’s camp (i.e. as *miles*; historically he did not: 54–5n.), but it is also



suggestive of Cicero's public silence from the end of 52 to 46: cf. Cic. *Marc.* 1 *Diuturni silenti . . . quo eram his temporibus usus . . . finem.*

**67 addidit inualidae robur facundia causae:** *facundia* (only here in *BC*), *inualidus* (*TLL* vii<sup>2</sup>.120.81–4), *robur* (i.e. *oratorium robur*, as at Quint. *Inst.* 10.5.4) and *causae* (*TLL* iii.6899.12–690.34) are all rhetorical terms. This kind of summative line on the power of oratory is regular in poetry before or after a speech: cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.505 *sic ubi mandatam iuuit facundia causam*, Pont. 2.5.69 *utque meis numeris tua dat facundia neruos*. Here *inualidae . . . causae* marks the speech as sophistry (see 62–85n.).

**68 hoc pro tot meritis solum te, Magne, precatur | uti se Fortuna uelis** 'This alone Fortune asks of you, Magnus, in return for all her services: that you be willing to use her to her full extent'. *precari* may take a double accusative (of the person and of the thing asked): A–G §396. *uti . . . uelis* is an indirect command, in apposition to *hoc*. This is an artfully contrived opening: *hoc . . . solum*, the object of the prayer, encloses the good services (*pro tot meritis*) that form the basis of the imprecation. It is also suggestively misleading: *tot merita* appear to be Pompey's to the *res publica*, not *Fortuna*'s to Pompey. When the reader arrives at *Fortuna* in the following line, the apparent meaning and mood of this line changes from a *captatio benevolentiae* ('you have done so much for us, Pompey', or even 'for me': cf. Cic. *Dom.* 31 *pro Cn. Pompei meritis erga me*) into a reminder of Pompey's own obligations (cf. 24n.) and the paradox of *Fortuna* praying to a person rather than the reverse is made clear. *te, Magne, precatur* echoes Pompey's own prayer to *Fortuna* at 2.699 *dux etiam uotis hoc te, Fortuna, precatur* and is echoed at the end of the speech at 84–5 *scire senatus auet, miles te, Magne, sequatur | an comes*. For Pompey as *Fortuna*'s favourite see 24n.

**69–70 proceresque tuorum | castrorum regesque tui cum supplice mundo:** a threefold progression through Roman aristocrats, to foreign kings and ultimately a hyperbole describing Pompey's forces as the whole world (52–5n.; cf. the narrator's similar strategy of describing the expanding and encompassing guilt for Pharsalus, as at 58–61; see 45–61n.). *proceres* is elevated (cf. Acc. *trag.* 325 *primores procerum prouocauit*) or used in self-conscious evocation of the higher genres (as at Pl. *Bacch.* 1053; Cic. *Fam.* 13.15.1); Lucan often uses it to refer to the Roman nobility or to the senate more specifically.

**71 affusi:** picks up *supplice mundo* from 70 and points, at least rhetorically, to a pose of prostrate supplication (*OLD* 7): cf. Sen. *Oed.* 71 *affusus aris supplices tendo manus*. **uinci socerum patiare** 'allow your father-in-law to be conquered' (indirect command after *rogamus* with ellipsis of *ut*), re-echoes 53 *nimum patiens socii*.



**72–3 *humani generis tam longo tempore bellum | Caesar erit?*** ‘Will Caesar (alone) be the (whole) human race’s war for so long a period of time?’ *humani generis* picks up Cicero’s inclusion of a *supplice mundo* from 70. It alludes to the scale of the resources at Pompey’s disposal and attributes a colossal stature to Caesar as one man fighting against the world (cf. Hardie 1993: 7–8). The contrast between *humani generis* and *Caesar* is made emphatic by their placement in the same position of consecutive lines (cf. Roche 2009: 54). For more on the ablative (*tam longo tempore*) rather than the more common accusative to express duration of time see NLS §54.

**73–4 *merito Pompeium uincere lente | gentibus indignum est a transcurrente subactis*** ‘that Pompey is slow to conquer is rightly intolerable to nations subdued by him racing past’. *merito*, emphasized by hyperbaton, modifies *indignum*, the predicate of *Pompeium uincere lente* (NLS §25). Cicero restates the complaint of the eastern kings at 57 *bella trahi patriaque procul tellure teneri*. Pompey’s speed had been a heavily cultivated aspect of his military reputation since the beginning of his career: cf. e.g. Cic. *Man.* 40 *unde illam tantam celeritatem et tam incredibilem cursum inuentum putatis?*

**75 *quo tibi feruor abit aut quo fiducia fati?*** ‘Where has your enthusiasm for battle [*OLD feruor* 5a] gone or where your confidence in fate?’ The contracted perfect form *abit* has a long final syllable. Alliteration and anaphora emphasize the contrast between non-rational and rational impetuses to war. Caesar thought that excessive *fiducia* in Pompey’s camp, especially after Dyrrachium, was precisely the problem: e.g. *Civ.* 3.72 *his rebus tantum fiducia ac spiritus Pompeianis accessit, ut non de ratione belli cogitarent, sed uicisse iam sibi uiderentur*, 3.96 (in Pompey’s camp) *tabernacula protecta hedera multaque praeterea quae nimiam luxuriam et uictoriae fiduciam designarent*.

**76 *de superis, ingrate, times***: ‘i.e. that they [*sc.* the *superi*] will desert you’ (Dilke). *timere* was the first verb applied to Pompey in the poem: 1.123 *Magne, times*. Pompey is *ingratus* because he trusts insufficiently in the positive support of the gods for the senate’s cause.

**76–7 *causamque senatus | credere dis dubitas?*** Cicero’s misreading of Lucan’s theodicy could not be more pointed: cf. 1.123 *uictrix causa deis placuit sed uicta Catoni*. On *causa* to underscore the constitutional position of the republican forces see e.g. Vell. 2.49.2 *consules senatusque causae, non Pompeio summam imperii detulerunt*.

**77–8 *ipsae tua signa reuellent | prosilientque acies: sua G obscures*** Cicero’s point (cf. 69–70 *proceresque tuorum | castrorum regesque tui*).

Hyperbaton of *ipsae* and *acies* envelops the action. *reuellere* is an unusual substitute for *conuellere* of pulling the standards out of the ground (only here and at Sil. 12.733; cf. e.g. Cic. *Div.* 1.77 *itaque signa conuelli et se sequi iussit*; Virg. *A.* 11.19 *uellere signa*). In military contexts, *prosilire* describes a sudden attack or charge (cf. e.g. *B. Afr.* 58.2).

**78 pudeat uicisse coactum** ‘you should be ashamed at having been compelled to conquer’, understand *te* with *coactum* (*esse*) as the object of impersonal *pudeat* (NLS §23); *uicisse* is in place of *uincere* for metrical convenience (H–S 351–2). Cf. 1.145 (Caesar) *solusque pudor non uincere bello*. Afranius had deployed a similar paradox at 4.338 *uictos ne tecum uincere cogas*. *pudeat* is a calculated goad to action, playing on Pompey’s high estimation of honour: on *pudor* in epic and in Roman culture see Hardie on Virg. *A.* 9.786–7 and Kaster 2005: 28–65.

**79 si duce te iusso, si nobis bella geruntur**: anaphora of *si . . . si . . .* drives home the point of *iusso* and *nobis*. **duce te iusso** ‘with you as our appointed leader’ (*OLD iubeo* 5b). *iusso*, a ‘constitutional’ additional to a common ablative absolute, looks to the accusation at 53–5 that Pompey desired *regnum*. Its combination with *si* is pointed: Pompey’s response and subsequent actions will prove whether or not he acts as the senate’s appointed leader. For Pompey’s appointment see 5.44–9. **si nobis bella geruntur**: dative of advantage, i.e. *non tibi* (Dilke): cf. 5.13–14 *docuit populos uenerabilis ordo | non Magni partes sed Magnum in partibus esse* and 2.322–3 (Cato) *me milite uincat | ne sibi se uicisse putet*.

**80 sit iuris, quocumque uelint concurrere campo** ‘let it be their [i.e. the *acies* of line 78] decision to join battle on whatever field they wish’: a summative line, heavy with assonance and alliteration. Cicero urges a complete surrender of Pompey’s strategic authority as general: advice radically undercutting the notion of Pompey as *dux* (79). The phrase *iuris esse* (*OLD ius* 13c) usually includes a possessive adjective showing to whom *ius* refers (cf. 54–5 *tot . . . gentes | iuris habere sui uellet*, which Cicero recasts). *uelint* is subjunctive not because of *quocumque*, but by attraction to *sit* (Handford 1947: 160–2; G–L 625, 629).

**81 quid mundi gladios a sanguine Caesaris arces?** *quid* ‘why?’ (*OLD quis* 16a). *mundi gladios* – a return to the rhetoric of 70 and 72 – expands beyond the Roman soldiers to include Pompey’s international forces (*mundus* is a synonym for *orbis terrarum*; cf. 2.48–9 *coniuret in arma | mundus*). *gladius* is less poetic than *ensis* (Axelson 1945: 51), but Lucan uses both (*gladius* × 45, *ensis* × 54 in *BC*; cf. Virg. *A.* *gladius* × 4, *ensis* × 64). The second half of the line is echoed at 10.420–1 *et nisi fata manus a sanguine Caesaris arcent | hae uincent partes*.

**82 uibrant tela manus:** *manus* could be ‘forces’ (*OLD* 22a) or ‘hands’ (*OLD* 1a). The action is a prelude to fighting (‘show, to inspire fear and to flex the arm’, Horsfall 2003 on Virg. *A.* 11.606), as at e.g. Liv. 21.28.1 and Ov. *Met.* 12.79.

**82–3 uix signa morantia quisquam | expectat** ‘hardly anyone can wait for your tardy signal’ (*OLD* *moror* 8b): i.e. *proeli committendi* (Caes. *Gal.* 2.21.3). Cicero adapts the common historiographical scene of soldiers eagerly awaiting the signal for battle (e.g. Liv. 21.54.4).

**83 propera, ne te tua classica linquant:** *te tua* are a pointed juxtaposition (cf. 77). *classica*, the military trumpets which would give the signal (82 *signa morantia*) for battle, is a metonym for *acies*; the phrase more literally suggests that Pompey’s trumpets will sound even without his orders.

**84–5 scire senatus auet, miles te, Magne, sequatur an comes** ‘The senate is eager to know, Magnus, whether it follows you as soldier or as entourage.’ Lucan uses *scire auere* only here in *BC*, perhaps because it is so commonly encountered in Cicero’s letters (cf. *TLL* II.1313.75–85). For *miles* . . . | *an comes* cf. 2.322 (Cato) *me milite uincat*. This final insult is emphasized in enjambment: the civilian nuance of *comes*, suggesting the senate as a member of staff to Pompey as a provincial governor (*OLD* 4a) or merely as accompanying him on a journey (*OLD* 1a), hits at Pompey’s reluctance to engage Caesar.

## 85–127 POMPEY ADDRESSES HIS TROOPS

Pompey’s second speech to his soldiers in *BC* is a reversal of his first at 2.526–609, where he attempted to stir his unwilling cohorts to action (Ahl 1976: 164; Sklenář 2003: 111). Here his oration falls into six sections: (i) 86–92: an opening capitulation and exoneration of himself from blame; (ii) 92–104: a vindication of his former strategy; (iii) 104–9: ‘philosophical’ objections to engaging precipitately; (iv) 110–14: apostrophes to Fortune and to Caesar in which he renounces his leadership and admits the triumph of Caesar’s prayers; (v) 114–19: predictions of heavy casualties and a (qualified) wish to die first, which segues into (vi) 119–23: the equally deplorable outcome of defeat (*malum*) or victory (*nefas*). Pompey’s emphasis upon the lost potential for a bloodless victory at 92–104 is balanced by his prediction of heavy casualties at 114–19.

In the corresponding speech at Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.2–5 Pompey is overly confident of victory (cf. 3.86.2 *scio me . . . paene incredibilem rem polliceri*): he makes known a predetermined strategy for the battle (3.86.3) in order to reassure his forces (3.86.2) and claims that this strategy will bring about an easy, bloodless victory for his forces (3.86.5 *ita sine periculo legionum*

*et paene sine ulnere bellum conficiemus. id autem difficile non est*). By contrast, Lucan's Pompey speaks like a 'victim doomed by fate' (Pichon 1912: 138): he offers a pointed antithesis to Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.2–5 in his silence on strategy, his gloomy prediction of mass casualties (89–90, 114–16), his renunciation of leadership (87–8, 92, 110–11), his attention to former strategy and its (now lost) capacity for bloodless victory (92–101), and his summation of battle with Caesar as permitting no positive outcome to either side (120–3). An important epic model is Virg. *A.* 7.594–600, the speech of Latinus capitulating to the angry crowd of Latins who throng around his palace to demand war (von Albrecht 1970: 283); see esp. Latinus' emphasis on contrary fates (594; cf. Luc. 7.86, 7.88), his prediction of casualties (595–7; cf. Luc. 7.114–19) and his own abnegation of leadership (600; cf. Luc. 7.110–11, 7.124–5). On the speech see Pichon 1912: 137–8; Lebek 1976: 224–6; Glaesser 1984: 121–5; Schlonski 1995: 121–9; Narducci 2002: 302–9; Sklenář 2003: 111–14; Rolim de Moura 2010: 76–8.

**85–6** Paired parallel clauses, enhanced by parallel alliteration beginning consecutive feet (*-it, -or, -it, -or-*); the second clause extends via a second object phrase of *sensit*: the sentence begins with Pompey and rises in progressively longer units through the gods and fate in imitation of Pompey's own increasing realization of the scale of the forces opposed to him. The last clause interlaces its word order with chiasmus of noun and adjective to make a frame of the opposing items *fata* and *menti*.

**85 ingemuit rector:** *ingemuit* marks Pompey's deep emotion (as at Virg. *Ecl.* 5.27, *A.* 10.789). *rector* (cf. 110 *regendas*; 125–7n.) denotes supreme military authority (*OLD* 4c) and also evokes Cicero's own ideal statesman, his *rector et gubernator ciuitatis* (*Rep.* 2.51.11); in this context of capitulation, it is emotive and ironic. At 9.194–5, Cato will call Pompey *rectorque senatus*, | *sed regnantis*.

**85–6 sensitque deorum | esse dolos et fata suae contraria menti** 'and he realized that this was the treachery of the gods and that the fates were opposed to his intentions'; cf. Virg. *A.* 12.647 (Turnus) '*quoniam superis auersa uoluntas*' (and the phrasing of *A.* 1.239 (Venus) '*fatis contraria fata rependens*', 7.293–4 (Juno) '*fatis contraria nostris | fata Phrygum*'); Hom. *Il.* 22.296–9 "Ἐκτωρ δ' ἔγνων ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φῶνησέν τε· ὦ πόπποι ἦ μάλα δὴ με θεοὶ θάνατον δὲ κάλεσσον | . . . ἐμὲ δ' ἔξαπάτησεν Ἀθήνη 'and Hector realized in his heart, and spoke, "Ah! the gods have summoned me to death . . . Athena has deceived me." Pompey had previously (like Cicero at 76) expressed confidence in the support of the gods (2.537, 2.554–5): these lines suggest a tragic ἀναγνώρισις 'recognition' (Arist. *Poet.* 1452a22–b8): he now sees what the situation is but is powerless to change it (*sentio* can

be a synonym of *intellego* (cf. ἔγνων above): Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.3). App. *BCiv.* 2.67.278 attributes Pompey's capitulation to 'a divine deception' (θεοῦ βλάπτοντος).

**87–90 si . . . si . . . sitque** adopts the structure of Cicero's speech at 79–80.

**87 'si placet hoc' inquit 'cunctis . . .':** sc. *uobis*. Pompey replies to the whole camp (95 *o caeci*), whose complaints (62 *cunctorum uoces*) Cicero has represented. *placet*: he responds to Cicero's senatorial emphasis with the language of senatorial protocol (*TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.2263.56–75).

**87–8 si milite Magno, | non duce tempus eget, nil ultra fata morabor** 'if the moment needs Magnus as soldier, not as leader, I will delay the fates no longer' (see 23n. for *ultra*). Cf. Virg. *A.* 2.521–2 (Hecuba on Priam arming for war) *non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis | tempus eget*; Luc. 4.351–2 (Afranius surrendering) *nil fata moramur: | tradimus Hesperias gentes*. *fata* gives voice to Pompey's realization at 86. There is a tradition that the good general should be both *dux* and *miles* (cf. Sal. *Cat.* 20.16 *uel imperatore uel milite me utimini*, 60.4 *strenui militis et boni imperatoris officia simul exequabatur*). Pompey responds to Cicero's final insult (84–5): *milite Magno* corresponds to the senate as *comes* (85); *duce* corresponds to the senate as *miles* (84). Pompey's grandiose third-person reference to self is emphasized by its alliterative pairing with *miles* as the *clausula*. In his declared intention to end delay and fight, Pompey's model, ominously, is the doomed Turnus: cf. Virg. *A.* 12.11 *nulla mora in Turno*.

**89 inuoluat populos una fortuna ruina** 'let fortune overwhelm the nations in a single destruction'; cf. 3.290–2 *tot immensae comites missura ruinae | exciuit populos et dignas funere Magni | exequias Fortuna dedit*. The delayed subject gives a threefold echo of the key adjective *una* (*fortuna ruina*). *ruina* is often 'downfall' or 'destruction' in Lucan (*OLD* 5b): e.g. 2.731 *quaeritur indignae sedes longinqua ruinae*.

**90 sitque hominum magnae lux ista nouissima parti:** cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.772 *sitque oculis lux ista nouissima nostris*. The Ovidian parallel shows that this is not an interpolated gloss on 89 (though omitted in **ZM**); Oakley 2009a: 81 notes a contrast between *populos* (89) and *magnae . . . parti*. The repetition *magnae . . . Magnum* in consecutive lines is rare but cf. 2.276–7 (or e.g. 130–1 *fato . . . fatum*). *lux . . . nouissima* is funereal (*OLD* *nouissimus* 3a). *ista* is equivalent to *haec* (*OLD* *iste* 4): it has no reference to Pompey's addressees, but is carried over from Ovid.

**91–2 testor, Roma, tamen Magnum quo cuncta perirent | accepisse diem** 'But I call you to witness, Rome, that Magnus had imposed on him this day on which all things will perish.' Pompey's apostrophe to a

personified Rome continues the thematic emphasis upon their intimate personal relationship established at 7-44 (even as it distances him from his immediate audience: Schlonski 1995: 123): cf. esp. the narrator's apostrophe to Rome at 29. *cuncta perirent* suggests the same universal ruination attributed to the war by the narrator at 58-9 *o superi, cum uobis uertere cuncta | propositum*. The adversative point of *tamen* is Pompey's submission (rather than free choice) in the key exonerating word *accepisse* (OLD 16b), which is enjambed for emphasis: it is used for the imposition of terms upon the defeated (e.g. Liv. 21.41.9 (Hamilcar) *graves impositas uictis Carthaginensibus leges fremens maerensque accepit*). A subjunctive verb (*perirent*: indirect question) dependent upon a perfect infinitive (*accepisse*) is often in secondary sequence, regardless of the tense of the main verb (*testor*) (A-G §585 (a); G-L 299): cf. Cic. *Man.* 27 *satis multa mihi uerba fecisse uideor qua re esset hoc bellum . . . necessarium*.

**92-4** Cf. 10.541 *uincendus tum Caesar erat sed sanguine nullo*; Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.4 (Pompey) '*sine periculo legionum et paene sine uulnere bellum conficiemus*'. Anaphora and polyptoton (*potuit, potui*) of the main verb in the same *sedes* in consecutive lines insistently contrast paired parallel sentences in asyndeton. The first sentence emphatically displaces the key phrases *uulnere nullo* and *labor belli* to the *clausula* and to the end of the clause respectively. In the second, Pompey expands on his own potential to have captured and delivered Caesar by restating the key notion, *sine caede*, and by heaping verbal action on Caesar (*ducem*) whose submission and capture Pompey lingers over in five consecutive long syllables (*subāctīm | cāptiūmq̄ue*). *paci*, displaced to the end of the second sentence, picks up *belli* at the end of the first. The change in person from *potuit* to *potui* underscores that each party had something to gain from Pompey's strategy: the war could have been bloodless for the rank and file; and Pompey could have defeated, captured and delivered Caesar.

**92-3** *potuit tibi uulnere nullo | stare labor belli* 'the work of war could have cost you no wound' (OLD *sto* 23 + abl. of price). *labor belli* is an epic periphrasis: cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.568 μάχης πόνος 'toil of war' (Dilke).

**93** *sine caede*: *caedes* for killing in combat is regularly found in both historiography and verse (OLD 1d); Pompey's lost notion of victory *sine caede* will become *hac clade* at 120.

**93-4** *subactum | captiūmq̄ue ducem uiolatae tradere paci*: personified *pax* comes as a shift in register amid standard military terms (e.g. Liv. 28.43.14 *post tot urbes ui captas aut metu subactas in dicionem*); it was also personified at 1.61-2 *pax missa per orbem | ferrea belligeri confescat limina Iani. uiolatae . . . paci* refers to Caesar's breaking of the peace in his invasion of Italy, while *tradere* suggests the legal process to which Pompey could have

surrendered him (i.e. *ad supplicium* or sim., e.g. Aug. *Anc.* 5.3 (*seruos dominis ad supplicium sumendum tradidi*)).

**95 quis furor, o caeci, scelerum?** *scelerum* is defining genitive (NLS §72(5)): cf. Cic. *Sest.* 14 *sceleris furore uiolatus essem, uocis libertate*, Flor. *Epit.* 2.19.12. Pompey echoes the narrator's reproach of his audience at 1.8 *quis furor, o ciues, quae tanta licentia ferri?*, as had the ecstatic *matrona* in her vision of Pharsalus at 1.681–2 *quis furor hic, o Phoebe, doce, quo tela manusque | Romanae miscent acies bellumque sine hoste est?* Pompey's indignation is stirred not by moral but by strategic blindness: at stake is not *licentia ferri* itself, but the effective strategic deployment of force. On *furor* see Lapidge 1979: 367–70; Glaesser 1984.

**95–6 ciuilia bella | gesturi metuunt ne non cum sanguine uincant** 'men who will wage civil war fear that they will conquer without bloodshed'. Pompey's position is the antithesis of Caesar's: cf. 1.145 *solusque pudor non uincere bello* and e.g. 2.439–40 *Caesar in arma furens nullas nisi sanguine fuso | gaudet habere uias* (Schlonski 1995: 124 n. 78). Verbs of fearing take *ne non* or *ut* + subj. in the negative (A–G §564); for *gesturi*: 47–8n. on *uisura* Pompey's *sententia* is his third and final restatement of this lost opportunity (after 92 *uulnere nullo* and 93 *sine caede*).

**97–101** Pompey's embittered rehearsal of the success of his strategy gains force from its rhetorical arrangement: at 97–9 it escalates through a rising tricolon with asyndeton, alliterative variation at the beginning of each line (*abstulimus . . . ad . . . agmina*) and homeoteleuton (*abstulimus . . . exclusimus . . . compulimus; terras . . . praematuras . . . rapinas*) to a summative claim at 99–101 of the demoralizing impact of these results upon Caesar's forces.

**97 abstulimus terras:** understand *ei* (dative of disadvantage). **exclusimus aequare toto:** understand the object *eum*. The phrase is elevated and echoes a *clausula* found in the *Aeneid* (× 4, e.g. 1.29–30 *iactatos aequare toto | Troas*).

**98 ad praematuras segetum . . . rapinas:** cf. 235–6 *Caesar statione relicta | ad segetum raptus moturus signa*. Caesar's troops also suffered famine at 6.106–17. *praematurus*, an agricultural term (TLL x<sup>2</sup>.698.65–72), is a *hapax* in *BC* and first here in poetry since Plautus and Afranius; in elevated style, it is transferred (enallage) from *segetum* onto *rapinas*. Pompey appears to contradict Caesar's description of his position near Pharsalus: *Civ.* 3.81.3 *ille idoneum locum <frumentaue> in agris nactus, quae prope iam matura erant*. Lucan's *praematuras* looks like a 'polemical correction' of Caesar's *prope iam matura* (for which: Thomas 1982; Hinds 1998: 2, 18).

**98–9 ad ... rapinas | ... compulimus:** a paradox.



**99–100 uotumque effecimus hosti | ut mallet sterni gladiis** ‘we brought it about that the enemy’s prayer was that he prefer to be killed by swords’, i.e. rather than by famine: the clause *ut mallet* explains the noun *uotum*, both are objects of *effecimus*. Cf. App. *BCiv.* 2.66.274 (Caesar’s troops) ‘on the whole it seemed preferable to them to do something <rather than> perish by inaction and famine’ (trans. Carter).

**100–1 mortemque suorum | permiscere meis** ‘to mingle the deaths of his own troops with those of mine’. *meis* is a brachylogy for *morti meorum* (a ‘compendious comparison’: H–S 826): the image is of intermingled Pompeian and Caesarian corpses on the field after the battle (so Keulen at *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.1543.67).

**101–4** ‘A great part of the war has been completed by these measures, thanks to which the new recruit need not fear the fight, provided that they seek the battle signals through the spurs of courage and the heat of rage.’ Pompey argues that his strategy would ultimately succeed provided that his troops seek battle motivated by *uirtus* and *ira* rather than by *timor* (104–5), and that they not be drawn into battle before the appropriate moment (107).

**101 belli pars magna peracta est** seems to pun (*pars magna* ‘the Great part’, i.e. Pompey’s part) on Pompey’s loss of strategic control over the war (‘the whole war’: *belli* pushed forward for emphasis). *bellum peragere* for completing a war (again at 8.428 and 9.1018) is a poeticism before Tacitus (*TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.1180.65–72); it looks like a qualified restatement of Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.4 (Pompey speaking) ‘*ita sine periculo legionum et paene sine uulnere bellum conficiemus*’, now made conditional not solely upon strategy (as at Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.2–3), but also upon the troops’ appropriate motivation (103–4).

**102 quibus effectum est ne pugnam tiro paueret:** Pompey acknowledges the relative inexperience of his own troops, which Caesar had derided at 1.305 *impletur ualidae tirone cohortes* and 1.311–12 *dux . . . | milite cum sub-ito*; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 7.3.2 *signa tirone et collecticio exercitu cum legionibus robustissimis contulit* and Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.2 (Pompey’s aim in revealing his strategy) ‘*quo firmiore animo in proelium prodeatis*’. For a negative result clause with *ne* introduced by impersonal *efficio* see *OLD* 3; *TLL* v<sup>2</sup>.174.9–14. Pompey introduces the tiro’s fear of battle either through misreading the cause of the camp turmoil at 45–57, or as a passing riposte to the soldiers’ accusation of his own fear at 52. It further allows him to move on to the notion of postponement of battle as a characteristic of the brave at 104–7.

**103 si modo uirtutis stimulis iraeque calore:** omitted in  $\Omega$  and only in **GV**, but to be retained. Homoearchon with 104 (*si* | *signa*) may account for



the scribe's omission of the line. Cf. 2.324–5 (the effect of Cato's speech on Brutus) *irarum* movit *stimulos* *iuvēnisque calorem* | *excitat* and Sen. *Dial.* 3.7.1 (*ira*) *extollit animos et incitat, nec quicquam sine illa magnificum in bello fortitudo gerit, nisi hinc flamma subdita est et hic stimulus peragitavit misitque in pericula audaces*. *stimulis* and *calore* are causal ablatives (A–G §404 (b); G–L 408). For *uirtus* as a goad to action in *BC*, cf. 1.120 (of Pompey and Caesar) *stimulos dedit aemula uirtus*, 8.328–30 *Lentulus omnis | uirtutis stimulis et nobilitate dolendi | praecessit*; on *uirtus* in Lucan more generally see Fantham 1995; Sklenář 2003: 101–52. For *irae calor*, cf. Lucr. 3.288 *est etiam calor ille animo, quem sumit in ira* and in Lucan 2.493 (Caesar) *calida proclamat* [Bentley; prolatus Ω] *ab ira*. For *ira* motivating troops see Oakley 2005: 21.

**104 signa petunt:** i.e. *pugnae*, as at 47. *petunt* is plural after the collective singular *tiro*: the change in number (from *paueret*) is not uncommon (A–G §317 (d) n. 1).

**104–5 multos in summa pericula misit | uenturi timor ipse mali:** the subject (pernicious *timor*) is delayed to the following line. The emphatic *ipse* and surrounding genitives reinforce the point that fear of an evil has actually prompted many into that evil. The tone is philosophical: cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.19 *timorem metum mali appropinquantis*; Ov. *Pont.* 2.7.5 *timor ipse malorum*. Curio illustrates Pompey's principle at 4.702–3 '*audendo magnus tegitur timor; arma capessam | ipse prior*'. *misit* is gnomic perfect (A–G §475). These lines do not explain 103–4 (*pace* Dilke): they strongly contrast the regular goad to war (*timor*) with the ideal (*uirtutis stimuli* and *irae calor*) and introduce the theme of courageous postponement, to be developed at 105–7.

**105–7 fortissimus ille est | qui, promptus metuenda pati, si comminus instent, | et differre potest** 'That man is bravest who, quick to endure fearful ordeals if they should press at close quarters, is also able to postpone them.' Pompey adopts the style of a (Stoic) philosophical maxim: cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.53 (quoting Chrysippus) '*fortitudo est*' inquit '*scientia rerum perferendarum uel affectio animi in patiēdo ac perferendo summae legi parens sine timore*'. Endurance is a regular constituent of courage for the Stoics (e.g. Diog. Laert. 7.126 'courage is concerned with things to be endured (περί τὰ ὑπομενέα)') and is itself an important Stoic virtue (Diog. Laert. 7.92–3), while caution is a common Stoic antithesis to fear (e.g. Diog. Laert. 7.116 'caution is the opposite of fear, being a reasonable avoidance. For the wise man will not be afraid in any way, but will be cautious'). Pompey combines one notion with the other. *comminus instent* is strongly suggestive of battle (Sal. *Cat.* 60.3 *comminus acriter instare*): *comminus* is regularly used of fighting at close quarters (OLD 1c) and *insto* suggests a line advancing (OLD 2a).

**107-9** Pompey's point is meticulously constructed: two clauses in asyndeton with threefold chiasmus of direct and juxtaposed indirect objects (*prospera . . . fortunae, gladio . . . discrimen*), infinitive verbs and indirect objects (*tradere fortunae, gladio permittere*) and objects and genitives (*prospera rerum . . . mundi | discrimen*), capped by a third clause comprising a terse paradox (109n.).

**107-8 placet haec tam prospera rerum | tradere fortunae:** responding to 68-9 '*te . . . precatur | uti se Fortuna uelis*'. *prospera rerum*, augmented by *haec tam*, is a neuter adjective as subject + adnominal gen. (see H-S 53; Coleman 1975: 126-7): the construction is found from Ennius (*Ann.* 84 Skutsch *in infera noctis*), is popular after Lucretius in poetry and prose admitting poeticisms, and is elevated in register (for *prospera* + gen. in Lucan cf. 5.782 *belli*, 7.684 *bellorum*). *tam prosperus*, absent in poetry before Lucan, is frequent in historiography of successful campaigns (e.g. Liv. 23.12.7, 24.42.9; Curt. 3.8.20). The unadorned *fortunae*, isolated after the verb and following the extravagantly weighty *haec tam prospera rerum*, belittles a force whose favour Pompey more characteristically expects (24n.).

**108-9 gladio permittere mundi | discrimen** 'to leave the critical moment of the world to the sword to decide', responding to 81 '*quid mundi gladios a sanguine Caesaris arces?*' Pompey's incredulous *mundi | discrimen* may evoke OLD 3 'the power of distinguishing', i.e. Caesarians and their opponents: a distinction subject to erasure after Pharsalus. The phrase is emphasized by the terminal position of *mundi* and by the molossus *discrimen*, enjambed before a strong sense pause in the second foot.

**109 pugnare ducem quam uincere malunt:** closest in form is Cic. *Marc.* 16 *uero uictor . . . declarat maluisse se non dimicare quam uincere*, but Pompey suggests non-battle as the means of conquering. This type of sententious paradox is more commonly found with *uinci* (or sim.; the same antithesis is reprised at 113-14(n.)): e.g. Liv. 5.8.11 *uinci ab hoste quam uincere per ciuem maluit*; Sen. *Ben.* 4.32.2 *qui in dissensione ciuili, quoniam ita expediebat rei publicae, uinci quam uincere maluit*.

**110 res mihi Romanas dederas, Fortuna, regendas:** Pompey further elevates his register in apostrophizing the divinity: for the grand *res Romanae* cf. Enn. *Ann.* 156 Skutsch *moribus antiquis res stat Romana uirisque*; Virg. *A.* 6.857-8; Hor. *Saec.* 66. His authority, encapsulated in the gerundive, comes as a late addition to the apparently complete *res Romanas*. For *regere* of non-monarchial or constitutional governance (and for the alliterative *res Romanas regendas*) cf. Cic. *Rep.* 2.23.5 (Romulus' senate) *temptaret . . . ut ipse regeret sine rege rem publicam*, Att. 7.25.1 (writing of Pompey) *ars difficilis recte rem publicam regere*.

**111 accipe maiores et caeco in Marte tuere:** imperfect verbs artfully frame the line. *maiores* (another pun: ‘Magnified’) points to territorial aggrandizement: cf. Enn. *Ann.* 495 Skutsch *qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere uoltis* and the censors’ prayer at the closing of the *lustrum*: Val. Max. 4.1.10 *quo di immortales ut populi Romani res meliores amplioresque facerent* rogabantur (Gruen 1984: 1.282–3). For the epic metonymy *caeco in Marte*, perhaps prompted by the proverbially blind *Fortuna* (Cic. *Phil.* 13.10; Fantham on 2.567–8) cf. Virg. *A.* 2.335 *et caeco Marte resistant* (a night battle, but *caecus* regularly denotes the uncertain outcome of war, cf. Serv. *ad loc.*). Pompey’s position has shifted from 2.566–8 ‘*Caesarne senatus | uictor erit? non tam caeco trahis omnia cursu | teque nihil, Fortuna, pudet*’. For the alliteration *maiores . . . Marte* cf. Virg. *A.* 8.557 *maior Martis iam apparet imago*.

**112 Pompei nec crimen erit nec gloria bellum:** the *crimen* would arise from defeat, as at 6.248 *dedecus hic belli Magno crimenque remisit*; cf. Cic. *Brut.* 135 (Caepio) *cui fortuna belli crimini, inuidia populi calamitati fuit*. The third-person self-reference *Pompei*, made emphatic in the initial position, might be cast positively as epic or sublime μεγαλοψυχία, or negatively as self-absorption. *gloria* is opposed to *crimen* previously at Liv. 40.15.5, 40.15.8.

**113–14 uincis apud superos uotis me, Caesar, iniquis: | pugnatur** ‘You prevail against me before the gods with your unconscionable [*OLD iniquus* 4c] prayers, Caesar: the battle is (already) on’; cf. 1.128 *uictrix causa deis placuit*. The jussive *pugnetur* (Laurentianus S. *Crucis*) is tempting. *pugnatur* explains the alliterative paradox *uincis . . . uotis . . . iniquis* (the damning adjective emphatically delayed): Caesar’s prayers were for a decisive battle; he knows that they are answered at 297–9. *uincis* and *pugnatur* echo in consecutive line beginnings Pompey’s contrast of 109 *pugnare . . . uincere*. At 195–6 Lucan suppresses Cornelius’ vatic exclamation ‘Νικᾷς, ὦ Καῖσαρ’ (‘You are victorious, O Caesar’, Plut. *Caes.* 47; cf. Gel. 15.18.3 *postea subito exclamauit Caesarem uicisse*, see 185–213n.): here Pompey anticipates his role by reading the signs portending his destruction before apostrophizing Caesar and making a sequence of ‘vatic’ predictions at 114–16. From these lines on much of Pompey’s language is capable of being interpreted in a bad sense, and as working as a bad omen against him: e.g. 112 *Pompei . . . erit nec gloria bellum*, 113 *uincis*, 114–15 *quantum scelerum quantumque malorum | in populos lux ista feret!*, 115 *quot regna iacebunt!*, 116 *sanguine Romano quam turbidus ibit Enipeus!*, 119–20 *neque enim victoria Magno | laetior*.

**114–16** Cf. Virg. *A.* 8.537–40 (Aeneas speaking) ‘*heu quantae miseris caedes Laurentibus instant! | quas poenas mihi, Turne, dabis! quam multa sub*

*undas | scuta uirum galeasque et fortia corpora uolues, | Thybri pater! poscant acies et foedera rumpant.*

**114–15 quantum scelerum quantumque malorum | in populos lux ista feret!** anaphora, assonance and homoeoteleuton mark a transition into an agitated sequence of exclamations. *scelerum* and *malorum* are partitive genitives (*OLD quantum*<sup>1</sup> 1a) denoting the active infliction and the passive suffering of evil. For *quantum scelerum* cf. Virg. *G.* 1.506 *tam multae scelerum facies*. Although *quantum mali* is common, *quantum malorum* is only elsewhere in Senecan tragedy and philosophy (*Oed.* 7, *Ep.* 75.15 *cogita quantum circa te uideas malorum*). *populos* are ‘the peoples of the world’ (*OLD* 1b).

**115 quot regna iacebunt!** ‘How many kingdoms will be brought low!’ (*OLD iaceo* 5a; *TLL VII*<sup>1</sup>.26.48–71); Pompey means his own forces (56n.).

**116 sanguine Romano quam turbidus ibit Enipeus!** *sanguine Romano* (cf. Virg. *G.* 1.491 *sanguine nostro*; Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.29 *Latino sanguine*: both of plains marred by civil war) is put first and isolated by the strong third-foot caesura. For the bloodied river in predictions of battle carnage (and as a poetic symbol of ‘essentialized’ epic subject matter: Hinds 2000) cf. Virg. *A.* 6.87 (Sibyl) ‘*Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno*’. The ‘river of blood’ image is also common outside epic in prophetic visions of war; cf. Liv. 25.12.6 (the *uates* Marcius predicts Cannae) ‘*multaque milia occisa tua deferet amnis in pontum magnum ex terra frugifera*’. The Enipeus, a tributary of the Peneus, was the primary river of the West Thessalian plain; Pompey’s prediction is fulfilled at 8.33–4 *Peneius amnis | Emathia iam clade rubens exibat in aequor*. The detail may have been in Pollio’s account of Pharsalus (N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.33) and gains point from the Enipeus’ reputation for surpassing beauty (Hom. *Od.* 11.239). For *ire* of the current of a river see *OLD* 3b.

**117–19 prima uelim caput hoc funesti lancea belli, | si sine momento rerum partisque ruina | casurum est, feriat:** Pompey’s words echo Cato’s wish to vow his own life at 2.306–13, esp. 306–7 *o utinam caelique deis Erebiq̄ue liceret | hoc caput in cunctas damnatum exponere poenas*. Cato’s professed intention was to expiate the guilt of war with his own blood (2.312–13). Pompey’s own wish is undercut (and interrupted) by the delusion that his death will tip the balance of events and mean the ruin of his *partes* (the notions are entwined in the chiasmus of ablatives and genitives *momento rerum partisque ruina*); the same delusion is revisited at 671–2 *timuit, strato miles ne corpore Magni | non fugeret, supraque ducem procumberet orbis* and is shattered by the narrator at 689–97. *caput hoc* is an ill-chosen metonym for Pompey: it inevitably foreshadows not the highly

spectacular death in battle he is currently imagining but his inglorious decapitation at 8.663–91. *funesti* (27n.) marks his expectation of defeat (TLL VI.1585.24). For *caput* in self-sacrificial contexts see Oakley on Liv. 9.9.19. *momentum rerum* ‘influence over events’ (OLD 7b); cf. 4.819 *momentumque fuit mutatus Curio rerum*. Attention will return to the *prima lancea belli* at 473–4 (Crastinus) *cuius torta manu commisit lancea bellum | primaque Thessaliam Romano sanguine tinxit*.

**119–20 neque enim uictoria Magno | laetior:** cf. Sal. *Cat.* 61.7 *neque . . . laetam aut incruentam uictoriam*. The emphatic enjambment of (negated) *laetior* as the first full foot before a strong sense pause signals the transition to Pompey’s final concern, the equally deplorable outcomes attending defeat or victory.

**120–1 aut populis inuisum hac clade peracta | aut hodie Pompeius erit miserabile nomen:** a disjunctive argument, enhanced by alliteration in the first limb (*populis inuisum hac clade peracta*), arranged around chiasmus of predicates and temporal phrases, and weighted in favour of the second possible outcome. Pompey’s reduction of himself to a *nomen* accords with his programmatic introduction at 1.135 *magni nominis umbra* (22n.). It speaks to his self-absorption that his concern is evoking the hatred or pity of the nations (OLD *populus* 1b; 1.131–3 for his populism): cf. Caesar’s own disjunctive prediction at 303 *aut merces hodie bellorum aut poena parata. hac clade peracta* echoes 101 *belli pars magna peracta est. clades* ‘disaster’ (OLD 1a) may further connote ‘defeat’ (OLD 2a). *inuisum nomen* is common in historiography (e.g. Liv. 2.2.3 (of Tarquinius Collatinus) *nomen inuisum ciuitati fuit*). For Pompey as a *miserabile nomen* cf. 8.816 (his grave) *miserabile bustum* and 9.202–3 (Cato’s eulogy of Pompey) *clarum et uenerabile nomen | gentibus*.

**122–3 omne malum uicti, quod sors feret ultima rerum, | omne nefas uictoris erit** ‘every hardship that the worst possible destiny [OLD *sors* 8a] will bring will be the conquered’s, every crime will be the conqueror’s’, explaining the disjunction at 120–1. The separation of the relative clause from its antecedent, anaphora of *omne* in the same initial position, asyndeton and antithesis balance the two clauses as evenly as possible. For *nefas* capping *malum* cf. Sen. *Tro.* 43–4 *Troia iam uetus est malum. | uidi execrandum regiae caedis nefas*. *nefas* is a key word in the poem (× 53 in *BC*; Virg. *A.*: × 18; cf. e.g. 1.6 *in commune nefas*, the outcome of the war, 1.37 *scelera ipsa nefasque*, the war itself). It describes the impious nature of the crimes of civil war, and is used by Lucan to create one of the enduring tensions of the poem: the choice of narrating or of holding his silence on a subject matter that is unspeakable (*nefas* < *ne* + *fari*); see Masters 1992: 205–15; Hardie 2013: 234–6.

**123–5 sic fatur et arma | permittit populis frenosque furentibus ira | laxat:** cf. Virg. A. 6.1 (Aeneas) *sic fatur lacrimans, classique immittit habenas*, 7.599–600 (Latinus, compelled into war) *nec plura locutus | saepsit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas* (Anzinger 2007: 136 n. 442). For similarities between Pompey and Latinus see Coffee 2009: 153 n. 58. Lines 125–7 will sharpen the contrast with Aeneas' control of the fleet. The elevated phrase *sic fatur* is favoured by Lucan ( $\times 11$ ; Virg. A.:  $\times 4$ ). *arma | permittit populis* echoes Pompey at 108–9 '*gladio permittere mundi | discrimen*' and anticipates the metaphor *frenosque . . . laxat* (OLD *permittere* 2a).

**125–7 et ut uictus uiolento nauita Coro | dat regimen uentis ignaumque arte relicta | puppis onus trahitur** 'and, just like a sailor overcome by violent Corus, he gives his control to the winds and with his skill abandoned he is borne along as the ship's useless freight'; cf. Ov. Tr. 1.4.11–12 *nauita confessus gelidum pallore timorem, | iam sequitur uictus, non regit arte ratem* (Cortius). Housman explained that the simile *ut uictus uiolento nauita Coro* precedes a metaphor (*dat regimen uentis ignaumque . . . onus trahitur*); for similar sequences of metaphors and similes Housman compared Aesch. Cho. 505–7 (probably not genuine: see Garvie *ad loc.*); Hor. S. 2.5.81–3; Sil. 4.302–10, 4.713–7.

These lines revisit the theme of the simile at 1.498–503 in which the abandonment of Rome at the onset of Caesar's invasion is likened to a ship's captain and crew jumping overboard during a storm; there Pompey's prior abandonment was the only mitigating factor in the flight of the general population (1.522). The storm in these lines correlates to the madness of Pompey's camp. *dat regimen uentis* (corresponding to 123–4 *arma | permittit populis*) paradoxically recasts the common idiom *dare uela uentis* (or sim.: e.g. 5.560 *dat carbasa uentis*) and demolishes Pompey's status as the *rector et gubernator ciuitatis* (Cic. Rep. 2.51.11; *regimen < regere*, 85n.), the helmsman of the ship of state (Quint. Inst. 8.6.44). Pompey as *ignauum onus* (the adjective in emphatic hyperbaton: 'utterly useless') puns on his status within the simile as *nauita* (OLD *nauitas* 'diligence, industry'; OLD *in*<sup>2</sup>) and robs him of *industria* (Serv. ad Virg. A. 1.345), a key military virtue for which he was famous (Cic. Man. 29.5). Corus, *uiolentus* as at 2.617 where it buffets Italy, was the north-west wind (Tarrant on Sen. Ag. 484): proverbially violent and stormy, it will be *secundus* for Caesar in pursuit of Pompey at 9.1000–1. Lucan uses *nauita* where metrically useful ( $\times 5$  in BC; contrast *nauta*  $\times 19$ ). On these lines see Miura 1981: 221–3; Johnson 1987: 77–8; Sklenář 2003: 114; Anzinger 2007: 136.

## 127-150 THE POMPEIANS REACT WITH FEAR, AND PREPARE THEIR WEAPONS

**127-8** Lucan segues from the simile describing Pompey back to the soldiers in his camp (last described at 45-57), but the vocabulary remains equally appropriate to a storm: e.g. *tumultus* (OLD 4), *fremo* (OLD 1a; cf. Virg. A. 1.56), *trux* (OLD 3), *pello* (TLL x<sup>1</sup>.1018.74-19.7). For this phenomenon ('narrative trespass') see Lyne 1989: 92-9.

**127-8** *trepido confusa tumultu | castra fremunt* 'the camp roars, disarrayed in agitated commotion'. Cf. 4.250 (Petreius' camp, castigated back into civil hatred) *feruent iam castra tumultu*; Lucr. 3.834 *omnia cum belli trepido concussa tumultu*; Virg. A. 8.4-5 *omne tumultu | coniurat trepido Latium*: all at the outbreak of war and denoting noisy excitement (Horsfall on Virg. A. 11.300); *confusa* compounds the sense of *tumultu* (TLL IV.267.10-12; cf. 47). For *fremo* associated with war cf. Virg. A. 4.229-30 *belloque frementem | Italiam*.

**128-9** *animique truces sua pectora pulsant | ictibus incertis* 'fierce hearts beat against their chests with irregular throbbing'. The alliterative clausula gives a mimetic effect. For the phrase cf. Hom. *Il.* 7.215-16 (upon seeing Ajax) Ἑκτορί τ' αὐτῷ θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι πάσσασεν 'and even Hector's heart beat fast within his breast' (Dilke); *Ciris* 345 (of Scylla's heart) *incipit ad crebrosque insani pectoris ictus* (with Lyne). The non-physical *animus* ('the psychological force driving the hearts', Lyne on *Ciris* 345) is substituted for *cor* (cf. Lucr. 2.269) as the subject of a hyperbolically physical action ominously evocative of expressions of grief: e.g. 4.182 *quid pectora pulsas?*; Sen. *Her. F.* 1112-13 *pectora . . . non sunt ictu ferienda leui*. For *ictus* of heartbeat see Lyne on *Ciris* 345; *pulsus* (OLD 2a; used at 4.757) is the regular term, here displaced onto *pulsant*.

**129-30** *multorum pallor in ore | mortis uenturae*: a clause remarkable for its dense assonance. For *pallor* of imminent death cf. Virg. A. 4.499 *pallor simul occupat ora* (with Serv.), 4.644 *pallida morte futura*. Ovid uses *pallor in ore* to evoke horror (*Invidia* at *Met.* 2.775, *Fames* at *Met.* 8.801 at line ending). *mortis uenturae* recalls 50 *mortis uicinae properantis . . . horas*.

**130** *faciesque simillima fato*: summative of the preceding descriptions. They look like doomed men (Postgate). For the phrase cf. Virg. G. 1.131 (the citron) *faciemque simillima lauro*, A. 6.522 (Deiphobus' sleep) *simillima morti*.

**131-2** *aduenisse diem qui fatum rebus in aeuum | conderet humanis* 'that the day had come that would inaugurate destiny for human affairs for all time' (the phrase is the subject of 133 *palam est*); cf. 195 *uenit summa dies*.



Pompey spoke of surrendering *res Romanas* to *Fortuna* at 110; the narrator now escalates the stakes of the battle to their extremes in terms both of scale (*OLD* 14b: *humanis* is emphasized by hyperbaton) and time (*OLD* *aeuum* 1c, emphasized by position). The relative clause expresses purpose (in secondary sequence after the historic present 133 *est*) and personifies *dies*. *conderet* (*OLD* 11a) is a bitterly ironic evocation of *ktisis* (*OLD* *condo* 10a = κτιζω; Hardie 1993: 11–12); cf. esp. Virg. *A.* 7.145 *aduenisse diem quo debita moenia condant*. The ultimate epic model is Hom. *Il.* 4.164–5 ἔσσεταί ἡμαρ ὅτ’ ἂν ποτ’ ὀλώλη Ἴλιος ἱρῇ | καὶ Πριάμος καὶ λαὸς ἑὺμμελίῳ Πριάμοιο ‘the day will come when sacred Ilios will be laid low, and Priam, and the people of Priam of the good ashen spear’ (trans. Murray).

**132 Roma quid esset** ‘what Rome would be’. One might also hear ‘what Rome was’, i.e. at that key moment in time. It is an indirect question after *quaeri* (which would be the impersonal passive *quaeritur* in direct speech), the simple imperfect *esset* is used with reference to either the present or the future (*NLS* §181). At stake is neither (Aeneidic) foundation nor (Iliadic) destruction (131–2n.) but definition and significance, encompassing the future conditions of Rome’s inhabitants, including Lucan and his contemporary audiences (their freedom or subjection to tyranny), and the calibre of her defenders in the moment of her greatest crisis.

**133 illo Marte** ‘by that battle’, ablative of means.

**133–4 sua quisque pericula nescit | attonitus maiore metu** ‘each man, shocked by a greater fear, is unaware [*OLD* *nescio* 2b] of his own danger’; mirroring the ἐκπληξίς ‘shock’ and φόβος ‘fear’ felt on behalf of Pompey which the narrator predicts for readers of the civil war at 211–13. *maiore metu* strongly suggests *Magno timetur* (138). The juxtaposition *attonitus maiore* hints at both Caesar’s programmatic likening to a thunderbolt 1.151–7 (*OLD* *attonitus* 1a) and Pompey’s name, thus encapsulating the source and the object of their fear.

**134–7** This interjected question equates the consequences of Pharsalus with worldwide inundation (134–5) and universal cataclysm (136). This passage strongly echoes Cato at 2.289–92 (his rationale for entering into the war) ‘*sidera quis mundumque uelit spectare cadentem | expers ipse metus? quis, cum ruat arduus aether, | terra labet mixto coeuntis pondere mundi, | compressas tenuisse manus?*’ The notion here has slipped from rejecting a philosophically informed detachment from fear (i.e. being *expers ipse metus*) to attending to a hierarchy of fears (137–8).

**134–5 quis . . . quis:** emotive repetition of the interrogative as at 2.98–9 *quis ille, | quis fuit ille dies . . . ?* The separation of the repeated element is elevated (Wills 1996: 85–7). **litora ponto | obruta:** cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.292



*derant quoque litora ponto*, 7.355 (in the primordial flood) *tellus . . . obruta ponto*. Lucan enjambes the significant term *obruta*, juxtaposing the opposite elements *litora ponto* (again at 135 *montibus aequor*; cf. Harrison 1991: 288–90) and effecting a sudden shift in scale from personal concerns (133–4) to universal destruction.

**135 *summis cernens in montibus aequor***: a common detail in descriptions of the deluge (Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.7–8; Ov. *Met.* 1.310 *pulsabantque noui montana cacumina fluctus*). The emotive *cernens* (e.g. Horsfall on A. 2.286) again cues the reader to ἐνάργεια (9–10n.).

**136 *aetheraque in terras deiecto sole cadentem***: an implosion of *aether*, regularly cast from a terrestrial perspective, is an important component in Lucan's ekpyrotic imagery (1.75–6, 2.290; Sklenář 2003: 68; on ekpyrosis in *BC* see Lapidge 1979). In Stoic astronomy the sun is located in the *aether* (Jones 2003: 334 fig. 2): collapsing *aether* would bring the sun down with it.

**137 *tot rerum finem*** 'the destruction of so many things'; in apposition to the objects of the preceding clauses. The phrase negates Jupiter's prophecy at Virg. A. 1.278–9 *his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono: | imperium sine fine dedi* (Reed 2011: 27–8).

**137–8 *non uacat ullos | pro se ferre metus*** 'there is no scope to bear any terror on their own behalf'; *uacat* is impersonal (*OLD* 5a). Circumstances compel the Pompeians into a travesty of Cato's *securitas* at 2.240–1 *cunctisque timentem | securumque sui*. A line ending in two consecutive bisyllables is unusual in Lucan (× 21); in *BC* they are always preceded by a monosyllable. For *ferre metus* (again at 6.597) cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.359–60 *quo sola timorem | ferre modo posses?* (*OLD fero* 19a).

**138 *urbi Magnoque timetur***: a concise, terminal *sententia* (Bonner 1966: 260–1, 264–7) juxtaposing Pompey and the city, emphatically associating the two, and expanding the literal meaning of *urbs* at Sen. *Med.* 886–7 *iam domus tota occidit, | urbi timetur* into a metonym for the republic (Ahl 1976: 159 'it is not easy to differentiate the two. The tottering oak that is Pompey is also the republic'). Fear for the safety of the city and its hero in epic terms variously figures Pompey as Hector (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 24.727–30) and his troops as Trojans, or as Turnus (replaying Hector) and his troops as Italians (e.g. Virg. A. 12.554–92).

**139–43** The Pompeians anxiously prepare their weapons for battle. Lucan's closest model is Virg. A. 7.626–40, where the Italians prepare their arms for war against the Trojans. Scenes of collective weapons-maintenance also feature in historiography, but in positive contexts: as the result of good generalship (Liv. 44.34.8–9) or pre-battle preparation

(Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 9.10.5). Lucan directs most attention to those units conspicuous in Pompey's defeat: the archers and cavalry (Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.4–94.4).

**139** *nec gladiis habuere fidem*: cf. Virg. *A.* 12.789 (Turnus) *hic gladio fidens*; Lucan's use of *gladius* is contemporary and technical: 'the weapon of Roman regular army issue' (Lyne 1989: 10; cf. 81n.).

**139–40** *nisi cautibus asper | exarsit mucro* 'unless the rough edge of the sword sparked on the whetstones'; cf. Virg. *A.* 7.627 *subiguntque in cote securis*; Hor. *Carm.* 2.8.15–16 *ardentis acuens sagittas | cote*. The spelling *cautibus* in the sense 'whetstone' is attested only here (**Z**<sup>2</sup> and possibly **U** have *cotibus*). It is thought either to derive from an urban pronunciation of *cotes* (plural of *cos*), whence the singular form *cautes* 'rocks', or else that the diphthong *au* developed at an archaic stage into long *o* (Prisc. in *GL* 2.39): see Pisani 1954.

**140–1** *omnis lancea saxo | erigitur* 'the tip of every light spear is straightened on a rock' (*OLD* *erigo* 3e); cf. 1.242 *curuataque cuspidē pila*. There were a variety of types of *lancea*, and though we should not expect too much precision, these weapons were typically used by auxiliaries (Southern 2007: 211).

**141–2** *tendunt neruis melioribus arcus, | cura fuit lectis pharetras implere sagittis*: *tendunt* 'they string' (*OLD* 5b); the spondaic *tendunt neruis* may suggest the exertion of re-stringing (Horsfall on Virg. *A.* 7.164). *neruis* 'bowstrings' reflects the original animal tendon material of the string (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 4.122 *νεῦρα βόεια* 'ox sinew'; Harrison on Virg. *A.* 10.131). *melioribus*, *cura* and *lectis* ('carefully chosen') each contributes to the image of the archers' diligent attention. Auxiliary units of archers, often of eastern origin, regularly accompanied legions (Southern 2007: 211). In *BC* archers and archery are often noted in Pompey's forces but never in Caesar's (he certainly had them: Caes. *Civ.* 1.26.1, 1.83.2): they play a small role in Pompey's wider association with the east (Masters 1992: 62; Hodges 2004: 76–151). Caesar reckoned that Pompey had 3,000 archers (*Civ.* 3.4.3) and he used them to good effect in the war (*Civ.* 3.44.6, 3.45.5). At Pharsalus, they were positioned with the cavalry on the left wing (Caes. *Civ.* 88.6; Cass. Dio 41.60.2).

**143** *auget eques stimulos frenorumque artat habenas* 'the cavalryman prepares larger goads and tightens the reins of the bridle'.

**144–50** The Pompeians preparing their weapons are compared to the Olympian gods arming to fight the giants. Throughout *BC* gigantomachy is presented as a 'mythical pre-enactment' of the civil war: cf. e.g. 1.34–6, 3.315–20, 6.347–8, 6.410–12 (Hardie 1986: 381; Feeney 1991: 296–7).

This example is unusual in that the majority of the poem's energy figures Caesar and his line as representatives of Jovian power (cf. Ahl 1976: 284–5; Feeney 1991: 295–6): this association, in gigantomachic terms, sits uncomfortably with his role as the attacker. Feeney 1991: 296–7 sees the poem as promoting an eccentric but consistent gigantomachic pattern, in which Caesar as giant and aspiring god is victorious, but there are other places in the text where the roles are inconsistently attributed (cf. Masters 1992: 39–40 on Massilia) and it may be more useful to see civil war contaminating the moral distinctions between the two (Hardie 1986: 154–6; 145n.). It may be that this comparison is focalized through the Pompeians themselves, or through the partisan stance of the poem's narrator (cf. Williams 1983: 180 on *A.* 10.565–70). These lines are distinct in content, style and register from Lucan's normal practice, they feature a high density of poetic words and usages, Greek words and consecutive end-stopped lines.

**144 *si liceat superis hominum conferre labores*:** cf. Virg. *G.* 4.176 (the coda to a comparison of bees and the Cyclopes under Aetna) *non aliter, si parua licet componere magnis*. The allusion marks the influence of Virgil's simile at *G.* 4.170–5 (Lucan transposes the remarks about disparity to the beginning of his comparison). *superis* stands for *laboribus superum* (a 'compendious comparison': see 100–11n.); its juxtaposition with *hominum* is figured in the verb *conferre* (*OLD* 8). In this gigantomachic context, *labores* may evoke Hercules.

**145 *Phlegra rabidos tollente gigantes*** 'when Phlegra was raising up the enraged giants', ablative absolute; cf. 4.597 (*Tellus non Phlegraeis Antaeum sustulit aruis*). Phlegra is the Pallene peninsula in Thrace (Hdt. 7.123), the site of the gigantomachy; its etymology < φλέγω 'burn' may be suggested in 146–8 *inclauit . . . rubuit flammis . . . recoxit*. It may have been used as a referent for Pharsalus (if not for the Phlegraeian Fields in Campania) at Prop. 3.11.37 (to Pompey) *issent Phlegraeo melius tibi funera campo* (with Heyworth and Morwood; Paratore 1936: 48–52). *tollere* can describe a father or other person formally 'picking up' a newborn child from the ground: a ritual of recognition or intent to rear the child; *tollente* may thus suggest the chthonic status of the giants (*OLD* 2; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.6.1) as well as their assault. Lucan had attributed *rabies* to the Pompeian camp at 51: but the two sides of the gigantomachy are easily contaminated in this civil war context (144–50n.).

**146 *Martius incaluit Siculis incudibus ensis*:** cf. Virg. *G.* 4.173 *gemit impositis incudibus Aetna* (and *G.* 2.540 for the clausula *incudibus ensis*). The Cyclopes (150n.), located in the Lipari archipelago north of Sicily, were armourers of the gods since Hes. *Th.* 149; the anvils are those of

Hephaestus, his forge is located under Etna at Virg. *G.* 4.173. *Martius* ‘belonging to Mars’ rather than ‘warlike’ in this context; the use of a noun-based adjective (cf. 147 *Neptunia* and 149 *Gorgoneos*) in place of a possessive genitive is characteristic of high epic style (e.g. Myers 2009: 52–3 on Ov. *Met.* 14.1). *ensis* (appropriately poetic) correlates to 139 *gladiis*, just as *incaluit* looks to 140 *exarsit*. Etna’s eruption, owing to the work of the Cyclopes, was a civil war prognosticon at Virg. *G.* 1.471–3. Ares does not regularly feature in literary accounts of the gigantomachy, but appears in art from the early sixth century (*LIMC* II s.v. ‘Ares’ 98): see Vian 1952: 73–6; Beck 1984: 39–43.

**147 et rubuit flammis iterum Neptunia cuspis:** correlating to 140–1 *lancea saxo | erigitur*. The Cyclopes had previously forged Poseidon’s trident for the Titanomachy (Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.2.1), hence *iterum* here, mirroring the repetitive cycles of Roman civil war (1.692, 2.66).

**148 spiculaque extenso Paean Pythone recoxit:** correlating to 141–2. Apollo reheats his arrows to re-edge and sharpen them; cf. Virg. *A.* 7.636 *recoquunt patrios fornacibus ensis* (with Horsfall). Paean is a cult-title of Apollo ‘the Healer’ (Hom. *Il.* 5.401; Aesch. *Ag.* 146), but in this context it may suggest a victory or battle song (LSJ Παιών II.2). Apollo killed the Python at Delphi, in a kind of a proto-gigantomachy (Fontenrose 1959: 239–47). At 6.407–9 Lucan places the origin of the serpent in Thessaly (Masters 1992: 175–6). For *extendere* of stretching out in death (*OLD* 2) cf. Virg. *A.* 5.374 *moribundum extendit harena*; here it denotes the coiling serpent loosening and straightening in death as at Prop. 4.6.35 *flexos soluit Pythona per orbes*.

**149 Pallas Gorgoneos diffudit in aegida crines:** the correlation to human armour now ends and Lucan treats ‘weapons peculiarly divine’ (Mayer 1981: 17). Cf. Virg. *A.* 8.435–8 (the Cyclopes) *aegidaque horrifera, turbatae Palladis arma, | certatim squamis serpentum auroque polibant | conexasque anguis ipsamque in pectore diuae | Gorgona desecto uertentem lumina collo*. Pallas is presumably parting the serpent locks of the Gorgon’s head so that her face will be visible in battle. The earliest and most detailed description of Athena thus arming herself is Hom. *Il.* 5.738–42. For the mythological background see Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.4.3; Ov. *Met.* 4.794–803. Lucan treats the origins of the Gorgon’s head in detail at 9.619–99. Fantham 1992 and Malamud 2003 develop the notion of the Gorgon’s head as a Pompeian symbol in *BC*; at 569–70 Pallas and the aegis oppose Mars in a simile comparing Caesar to Mars. *Gorgoneos crines* is Ovidian (*Met.* 4.801; 146n. for the adjective type, transliterating Γοργόνεος ‘Gorgon’s mask’).

**150 Pallenaëa Ioui mutauit fulmina Cyclops** ‘the Cyclopes made new thunderbolts for Jupiter to use at Pallene’ (*OLD* *muto* 3a); *Cyclops* is

singular for plural (146n.). *Palleneae* (apparently Lucan's coinage) effects ring composition by referring back to *Phlegra* at the beginning of the simile (145n.).

### 151–184 PORTENTS OF DISASTER

An extensive catalogue of prodigies had marked the eruption of the war at 1.522–83 and invites comparison with the present list: Roche 2009: 17–19. Both begin with lightning (152–60; cf. 1.522–44) and end with apparitions of the dead (179–80; cf. 1.568–83), but the present catalogue is compressed in scale and variety by comparison: lightning (152–60), reluctant standards (162–4), ill-omened sacrifice (165–71), prodigies seen in the topography of Thessaly (172–6), finally the deathly appearance of the troops themselves and the ghostly apparition of dead family members seen among them (177–80).

**151–7** The Pompeian forces, just compared to the gods arming for gigantomachy, encounter a savage lightning storm (itself incorporating nuances of cataclysm and gigantomachy) in which they are repeatedly struck (158–60): an image that immediately undercuts their correlation to Jovian power at 150. In the historical sources, the storm at 152–60 occurs when the Pompeian forces march towards Emathia from Dyrrachium (the equivalent moment in *BC* is 6.330–1 (Pompey) *terraeque secutus | deuia, qua uastos aperit Candauia saltus*). The phrases at 152–3 *Thessala rura | cum peterent* and 164 *usque ad Thessaliam* point to Lucan's narration of this historically earlier event in the present sequence of prodigies. Cf. Val. Max. 1.6.12 *Cn. etiam Pompeium Iuppiter omnipotens abunde monuerat ne cum C. Caesare ultimam belli fortunam experiri contenderet, egresso a Dyrrachio aduersa agmini eius fulmina iaciens, examinibus apium signa obscurando, subita tristitia implicatis militum animis, nocturnis totius exercitus terroribus, ab ipsis altaribus hostiarum fuga*; cf. Obsequens 65a *a Dyrrhachio uenientibus aduersa fuerunt fulmina*; Cass. Dio 41.61.2 (clearly at Pharsalus). If the doubtful line 154(n.) is removed or ignored a (perhaps fortuitous) acrostic at 154–8 C–A–E–D–E literally spells out the meaning of the *prognostica* for the reader; see Wheeler for discussion.

**151–2 non tamen abstinuit uenturos prodere casus | per uarias Fortuna notas** 'Yet Fortune did not refrain from revealing the coming disaster through varied signs.' The elevated periphrasis *non tamen abstinuit* (echoing Virg. A. 2.534) ostensibly resumes the narrative from line 143, but Lucan begins at a point before the beginning of our book (151–7n.). *casus* 'military defeat' (*OLD* 5b, plural for singular), is often used of future events more generally (e.g. Ov. *Met.* 15.559 *casus aperire futuros*). On *Fortuna* see 1n. (*lex aeterna*).

**153 totus uenientibus obstitit aether** ‘the whole firmament blocked their path as they approached’ (*OLD* *obsto* 2a): *uenientibus* so soon after 151 *uenturos* . . . *casus* suggests the Pompeians rushing headlong into oncoming disaster. The sky obstructing the terrestrial motion of an army is a paradox strongly evoking a gigantomachic assault on heaven. *aether* is emphatically separated from its adjective to frame the clause; its etymology (< αἴθερ ‘burn, blaze’) is suggested in 155 *faces immensoque igne columnas*.

**154** This line is awkwardly expressed (‘lightning broke through the clouds into the men’s eyes’) and difficult to parallel. It is omitted in **ZMP** and not interpreted in *ASL* or *Comm. Bern.*, but present in **Z<sup>2</sup>GV** and added at the bottom of the page in **U**. Cortius removed it; Bentley’s argument against it was that 157 has the same sense but is more elegant and 154 breaks the sequence of verbs with *aether* as their subject: *obstitit, detulit, clausit, excussit, perfudit, liquauit*.

**155 aduersasque faces:** flashes of lightning (*OLD* *fax* 4b). *aduersas* picks up 153 *obstitit*: it is both literal (‘head-on’, *OLD* 4) and figurative in sense (‘presaging misfortune’, *OLD* 9d). Its sense ‘hostile’ (*OLD* 8c) might hint further at gigantomachy. **immensoque igne columnas** ‘pillars of immeasurable fire’ (*OLD* *columna* 5a); cf. Sen. *Nat.* 6.26.3 (a portent of destruction) *columna ignis immensi*.

**156–7 trabibus mixtis auidos typhonas aquarum | detulit** ‘it cast down cyclones voracious for water together with fireballs’. For *deferre* of meteorological phenomena cf. e.g. Lucr. 5.1092 *fulmen detulit in terram*. *trabes* are a rare type of fireball noted for their immense size (Sen. *Nat.* 1.15.4; *OLD* *trabs* 3b). *auidos* more usually denotes the downward absorption of whirlpools and sim. (*TLL* 11.1428.33–41); here in tension with *detulit*, it marks an uncanny upward movement of water from the earth: terrestrial and celestial boundaries are dissolved and normal meteorological patterns are reversed. The personified *auidos typhonas* (Greek accusative) hint at gigantomachy via Typhon, a chthonic deity often confused with or counted among the giants (Lucan appears to count him a giant at 4.595).

**157 oculos ingesto fulgure clausit:** cf. 1.154 (Caesar as lightning bolt) *obliqua praestringens lumina flamma*. The tricolon crescendo at 155–7 is capped by this summative clause which returns the focus to the human protagonists in the middle of the maelstrom. *oculos clausit* simultaneously suggests the inability of the Pompeians to see (the significance of) the portents and evokes the last rites performed for the dead (*OLD* 4b).

**158 excussit cristas galeis:** cf. Virg. *A.* 12.493 *hasta tulit summasque excussit uertice cristas*.

**158–9** Cf. Sen. *Nat.* 2.31.1 (the effects of lightning) *manente uagina gladius ipse liquescit et inuiolato ligno circa pila ferrum omne destillat*.

**158–9 capulosque solutis | perfudit gladiis** ‘it drenched their hilts with melted swords’. *capulos* (‘hilts’) is a surprising substitution for *uaginam* ‘scabbard’ (cf. 158–9n.); it may here denote *uaginas* by metonymy (cf. also Non. p. 4 Lindsay *capulum dicitur quicquid aliam rem intra se capit*), or Lucan may imagine that the swords are drawn and held upright (Ollfors 1967: 34–5 suggests that the soldiers here are still maintaining their weapons from 139–43, but 152–3 *Thessala rura | cum peterent* makes clear that the storm took place on the march to Thessaly, cf. 151–7n.).

**159 ereptaque pila liquauit** ‘snatches away and dissolves their javelins’, i.e. their iron tips.

**160 aetherioque nocens fumauit sulphure ferrum:** a golden line (abVAB: 8n.) providing details from natural science (e.g. Lucr. 6.220–1; Sen. *Nat.* 2.53.2 *quocumque decedit fulmen, ibi odorem esse sulphuris certum est*). The sword is guilty (not ‘dangerous to touch’, Dilke) because it is ready to be used in a civil war (*Comm. Bern.*).

**161** Housman xxii–xxiii rightly (*pace* Bradley 1969: 176–8) expelled this line, which was inserted early enough to be in the text of the Berne scholiast. Repeated *signa* (161, 164) are awkward as subjects of 163 *mersere*; also *signa* at 161 anticipates and utterly deflates the climactic and delayed *signa* at 164. The portent of bees clustering on the standards is listed with lightning in other sources (Flor. *Epit.* 2.13.45; Val. Max. 1.6.12 (151–7n.); Cass. Dio 41.61.2; Obsequens 65), hence our line: ‘the interpolator seems to have missed in Lucan a detail which he found in other accounts and to have inserted it regardless of consequences’ (Housman xxiii); but here it is confused with (and obscures) the separate portent of weeping standards. The verb *cooperio* is only here in Lucan and very rare elsewhere in poetry (once each in Lucr., Hor. S.).

**162–4** ‘and hardly could the standards be torn up from the ground, but with increased weight they pushed down and overwhelmed the standard-bearer’s head; adrip with tears, only as far as Thessaly did they belong to Rome and to the state’ (Braund).

**162 uixque reuulsa solo:** standards which were not easily drawn from the earth before battle were taken as a sign from Jupiter that a general’s auspices were invalid (Konrad 2004; Wardle 2006: 295); e.g. Cic. *Div.* 1.77 and 2.67; Liv. 22.3.12–13 (all Flaminius at Trasimene); and Aeneas’ concern at Virg. *A.* 11.19–20 *ubi primum uellere signa | adnuerint superi*.



**162–3 *maiori pondere pressum | signiferi mersere caput*:** evoking in miniature the first of Lucan's causes of the war at 1.71–2 *nimioque graues sub pondere lapsus | nec se Roma ferens* and (assisted by the pun *maiori pondere*) Pompey's programmatic shortcoming at 1.139 *pondere fixa suo est*. The poem devotes consistent thematic attention to weight, its downward pressure, and implosion (Roche 2009: 189). *mersere* 'thrust down' (*OLD* 8) is an unusually strong word in this context; it recalls the narrator's framing of the war at 6.7–8 as *alea fati | alterutrum mersura caput* (where *mersura* means 'plunge in ruin', *OLD* 10b). The metrically convenient ablative singular of *maior* in *-i* is found again at Sil. 13.409 (*TLL* VIII.122.13–19).

**163 *rorantia fletu*** agrees with *signa*: no a miraculous personification, adapting the more usual portent of weeping statues (as at Virg. *G.* 1.480; Ov. *Met.* 15.792; Sen. *Thy.* 702).

**164 *usque ad Thessaliam Romana et publica signa*:** echoing 152–3 *Thessala rura | cum peterent* (151–7n.). *usque ad* 'only as far as' (Braund), i.e. after which the standards will be an individual's; cf. 2.319–20 (Cato) '*quin publica signa ducemque | Pompeium sequimur?*' (also 9.256–8); Tac. *Ann.* 1.1 *postquam Bruto et Cassio caesis nulla iam publica arma*.

**165–7** Pompey had been compared to a bull driven from its pasture at 2.601–9. Hardie 1993: 56 suggests that Pompey's own flight is foreshadowed in the flight of the victim, and that the escape of the bull points to the absence of a sacrificial victim (i.e. Pompey) by whose death the sequence of civil wars might have been ended at Pharsalus. This omen is recounted in the historical sources (151–7n.).

**165–6 *admotus superis discussa fugit ab ara | taurus*** 'the bull brought forward to the gods smashed the altar and ran away' (adapting Braund); cf. Virg. *A.* 2.223–4 *fugit cum saucius aram | taurus et incertam excussit ceruice securim*. The more common expression is *admotus aris*, as at 1.608–9 *sacris tunc admouet aris | electa ceruice marem*, or Virg. *A.* 12.171 *admouitque pecus flagrantibus aris*. Lucan may substitute *superis* because the sprinkling of a victim with *mola salsa* before the altar, prior to its slaughter, transfers it from the human to the divine sphere (Scheid 2003: 83–4).

**166 *Emathios praeceps se iecit in agros*:** i.e. onto the plain of Pharsalus (*OLD* *Emathius* b), to where the Pompeian forces will descend at 214–16.

**167 *nullaque funestis inuenta est uictima sacris*:** a golden line (abvAB: 8n.). The incomplete rites are *funesta* because they presage misfortune (*OLD* 4b; cf. 27n.).

**168–71** The narrator apostrophizes Caesar, as though he had brought about the opportunity for battle through the powers of the underworld.



The conceit is that the state gods would have refused. The cluster of infernal powers the narrator attributes to Caesar has its parallel in Erictho's prayer at 6.695–18 (particularly her opening invocation of *Eumenides Stygiumque nefas* at 695); cf. also 1.631–4 (Arruns, reacting to the extispicy) '*uix fas, superi, quaecumque mouetis, | prodero me populis; nec enim tibi, summe, litauī, | Iuppiter, hoc sacrum, caesique in pectora tauri | inferni uenere dei*'.

**168–9 at tu quos scelerum superos, quas rite uocasti | Eumenidas, Caesar?** The indignant repetition of interrogatives is heightened by parallel assonance (*quos . . . superos, quas uocasti Eumenidas*). For *scelerum superos* – ironically of underworld divinities – cf. 2.80 *terribilisque deos scelerum*, there associated with Caesar's uncle, Marius, and also anticipating future civil war atrocities (*Mariumque futurum*). *rite uocasti* 'invoke with ritual' (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.32.16 *rite uocanti*; thus Caesar describes his prayers at Troy at 9.997). The juxtaposition *Eumenidas, Caesar* – heightened by comprising a half-line and by the strong sense pause after the main caesura – reflects their association in the poem. Erictho had prayed to the Eumenides at 6.695; at 3.15 Julia says she had seen them in the underworld, holding torches to shake at Pompey's arms.

**169–70 Stygii quae numina regni | infernumque nefas et mersos nocte furores:** a tricolon of non-specific divinities (*numina*) and specific abstractions (*nefas, furores*), the latter perhaps explaining the former (if so, *-que* is epexegetic). Each noun is insistently located in the underworld via varying descriptors (genitive, adjective, perfect participle). *nox* is often used of the gloom of the underworld (*OLD* 5b). *furores* are not to be taken as referring to the Furies (cited at 169), but as forms of madness (Zissos 2008: 404 on V. Fl. 1.796). Personified *nefas* was among the objects of Erictho's prayer 6.695 (168–71n.).

**171 impia tam saeue gesturus bella litasti:** virtually explanatory of the preceding: *impia bella* (with the adjective emphatically separated from its noun: cf. 196) and *tam saeue* account for the need of underworld divinities. *litare* is a technical term denoting acceptable sacrifice (Serv. on A. 2.119), the construction with the accusative of the god (rather than the dative) is less common (*OLD* 2c); the verb is only used elsewhere in the poem of Erictho (6.524) and by Arruns (1.634: see 168–71n.). *saeuus* is not used exclusively of Caesar in book 7, but for a representative illustration of his savagery see 557–85.

**172–3 dubium, monstisne deum, nimione pauore | crediderint** 'it is doubtful whether they believed because [these were actually] portents of the gods or because of their own excessive fear' (indirect question; see *OLD -ne* 5b). *monstis* and *pauore* are arranged in chiasmus

around their modifiers; the archaic genitive *deum* adds a solemnity of tone (Virg. A. 3.59 *monstra deum refero* (with *pauor* at 57); Horsfall on Virg. A. 2.156) only to be immediately deflated by *nimio pauore*, offering a second alternative in a metrically more emphatic position; on this as a technique of the Tacitean ‘weighted alternative’ see Sullivan 1976: 315. The *pauor* of Pompey’s troops had been detailed at 133–8. Here Pompeian *pauor* calls into question the authenticity of the following portents and suggests instead a kind of collective hallucination brought on by terror. Doubt regarding the authenticity of prodigies was traditional; perhaps it responds here to the extravagant scale of the immediate prodigies at 173–4 (and cf. Virg. A. 8.691 *credas* quoted at 173–4n.), but it is unclear to how many of the following prodigies it applies (183–4n.).

**173–6** Olympus, Pindus and Ossa are grouped together in the Thessalian excursus at 6.333–42.

**173–4 multis concurrere uisus Olympo | Pindus:** cf. Virg. A. 8.691–3 (the ships of Actium) *credas . . . montis concurrere montibus altos* (a passage with gigantomachic resonances; Hardie 1987: 166); Ov. *Met.* 7.62–3 (the Symplegades) *mediis concurrere in undis | dicuntur montes*. Lucan’s image of one mountain crashing into the other is revealed in enjambment. *concurrere* is frequently of troops charging into battle (*OLD* 3), as at 196 *impia concurrunt Pompei et Caesaris arma*. Olympus is north and Pindus west of Pharsalus (see Masters 1992: 151 map 3); they are conceived of as being located *ex aduerso* (Plin. *Nat.* 4.30).

**174 abruptis mergi conuallibus Haemus** ‘Haemus [seemed to] plunge into sheer recesses’. Here and at 6.576 Lucan (apparently under the influence of *Haemonius* < *Haemon*) puts Haemus near the Pharsalian plain, but it was in northern Thrace (Plin. *Nat.* 4.45).

**175 edere nocturnas belli Pharsalia uoces:** cf. 1.578–80 *quanto clamore cohortes | miscentur, tantum nox atra silentibus auris | edidit*. *Pharsalia* ‘the district around Pharsalus’ (Bruère 1951b). For the type of prodigy cf. e.g. Liv. 5.32.7 *uocem noctis silentio audisse clariorem humana*.

**176 ire per Ossaean rapidus Boebeida sanguis:** recalling Pompey’s prediction of the Enipeus turbid with Roman blood at 116 and the blood-stained waters at Caere, a prodigy before Cannae (Liv. 22.1.10; Val. Max. 1.6.5; Pease on Cic. *Div.* 1.92 with references). Lake Boebeis lay south of Ossa and ran alongside the Pelion range that bounded Thessaly. Lucan’s Greek accusative preserves *Boebeida*’s form and position from the *Iliad* (2.711 Βοιβηίδα λίμνην). For *ire* see 116n.

**177–80** Dilke notes the influence of Theoclymenus’ description of the suitors’ impending slaughter at *Od.* 20.351–7 (see 177, 178, 179–80nn.): an allusion which again prefigures the defeat of the Pompeians.

**177 inque uicem uultus tenebris mirantur opertos:** cf. Hom. *Od.* 20.351–2 (Theoclymenus, to the suitors) ‘νυκτὶ μὲν ὑμέων | εἰλύαται κεφαλαί τε πρόσωπά τε’ ‘Shrouded in night are your heads and your faces’. Lucan’s key adjective (*opertos*, cf. εἰλύαται) is emphatically displaced to the line’s end, and he stresses a reciprocity (*OLD inuicem* 3) whereby each soldier both embodies and observes the omen. *mirantur* corresponds to θαυμάζω, regularly of responses to the supernatural (e.g. *Od.* 3.373, 13.157); its appearance with 183 *gaudet* hints at the ‘amazement’ and ‘pleasure’ typically evoked by contemplating works of art (e.g. Virg. *A.* 8.730); see Breed 2006: 79. So far from trying to comprehend the omen (cf. 197n. on *notauit*, 198–9n. on *perspexit*), the Pompeians instead opt for a mode of viewing which is dangerously superficial.

**178 pallere diem** ‘the day growing dim’ (*OLD pallesco* 3). Florus (2.13) records *interdiu tenebrae* among the prodigies before Pharsalus, and Theoclymenus includes a darkening day at Hom. *Od.* 20.356–7 ‘ἥελιος δὲ | οὐρανοῦ ἑξαπόλωλε, κακὴ δ’ ἐπιδέδωμεν ἀχλὺς’ ‘and the sun has perished out of heaven and an evil mist covers all’. **galeisque incumbere noctem:** the *galea* is normally a highly visible, highly reflective object of terror: Virg. *A.* 9.374 (*galea*) *radiisque aduersa refulsit*, 10.869 *aere caput fulgens*; Ov. *Met.* 13.105 *nitor galeae*. The verb suggests oppressive weight (*OLD* 4c; for the theme of weight and downward pressure in *BC* see 162–3n.).

**179–80 defunctosque patres et iuncti sanguinis umbras | ante oculos uolitare suos:** Hom. *Od.* 20.355–6 (Theoclymenus) ‘εἰδώλων δὲ πλέον πρόθυρον, πλείη δὲ καὶ αὐλή, | ἱεμένων Ἑρεβόσδε ὑπὸ ζόφον’ ‘and full of ghosts is the porch and full the court, of ghosts that hasten down to Erebus beneath the darkness’ (trans. Murray). Lucan’s omen reverses the movement of Homer’s Ἑρεβόσδε and foreshadows the dream of the Caesarians after the battle at 772–6 (esp. 775–6: slain brothers and fathers). *defunctus* is common in funerary inscriptions (*TLL* v<sup>1</sup>.377.50–4); cf. also Sen. *Oed.* 789 *genitor sine ulla caede defunctus iacet*. *iuncti* is the conjecture of Heinsius (*cuncti* **Z**, *cunctis* **M** (it seems), *cunctas* **GC**, omitted in **PUV**): *sanguinis* needs an epithet to make sense here and *iuncti sanguinis umbras* ‘ghosts of kindred blood’ (Braund; *OLD iunctus* 2) recalls 1.111–12 (the children of Julia) *pignora iuncti | sanguinis. uolitare* is very commonly used of disembodied souls (*OLD* 1b). Petronius’ Eumolpus adapts this sentence at 123.216–17 *arma, cruor, caedes, incendia totaque bella | ante oculos uolitant*.

**180–1 sed mentibus unum | hoc solamen erat:** cf. Virg. *A.* 10.858–9 (the horse of Mezentius) *hoc decus illi*, | *hoc solamen erat*, 3.660–1 (the sheep of Polyphemus) *ea sola uoluptas | solamenque mali*, where O’Hara 2017: 147 sees wordplay in *sola . . . solamen*: Lucan’s *unum | . . . solamen* may also be a pun. The notion of family, esp. children, as the one *solamen* for the afflicted is common in tragedy (e.g. Sen. *Tro.* 703–4 *unicum adflictae mihi | solamen hic est*, *Med.* 945–6) and helps contextualize Lucan’s imminent, radical inversion of this notion at 181–4.

**181–2 quod uoti turba nefandi | conscia** ‘that the crowd [is] conscious of their unspeakable prayer’. Both *nefandi* and *conscia* are empathic in their placement. Note that the army is now described as a *turba*.

**182–3 quae patrum iugulos, quae pectora fratrum | sperabat:** revisiting the oath of the Caesarian Laelius at 1.376–7 *pectore si fratris gladium iuguloque parentis | condere me iubeas*. Here anaphora, alliterative chiasmus of objects and genitives, the compressed use of *iugulos* (*OLD* 2b, i.e. as exposed to weapons) and *pectora* (*OLD* 2b, i.e. as turned to meet danger) and the enjambed *sperabat* – shocking in this context and exceeding Laelius’ reluctant acquiescence (Leigh 1997a: 216; cf. 1.378 *inuitta peragam tamen omnia dextra*) – underscore key details in Lucan’s inversion of family as solace for the afflicted (180–1n.). These physical aspects are reprised at 626–30.

**183 gaudet monstis:** marking an escalation in emotion from *sperabat* and establishing another momentary paradox to be explained in the following lines (cf. 177n.).

**183–4 mentisque tumultum | atque omen scelerum subitos putat esse furores** ‘it thinks that the agitation of its mind and its sudden madness are an omen of its crimes’ (Braund, adapted); *omen scelerum* is taken ἀπὸ κοινού with both *mentisque tumultum* and *subitos . . . furores* (Cortius). The Pompeians accept the phenomena as supernatural messages but interpret them in a completely contrary manner: as a positive omen (*OLD* 1d) for a crime they are bent upon committing. For *mentis tumultum* cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2.16.10, where *tumultus* equally suits civil disturbance and psychological turmoil (N–H *ad loc.*); add Sen. *Oed.* 329 *tumultus mentis attonitae uagus*. For *subitos furores* cf. Virg. *A.* 4.697 (Dido) *subitoque accensa furore* in the same *sedes*.

## 185–213 THE AUGURY OF CORNELIUS; THE NARRATOR ON READING PHARSALUS

On the day of Pharsalus, at Patavium in northern Italy, Gaius Cornelius discerned via augury the time and course of the battle and predicted Caesar’s victory over Pompey (*RE* s.v. ‘Cornelius’ 20). Cornelius was an

acquaintance and compatriot of Livy, and Plutarch (*Caes.* 47) repeatedly cites Livy (i.e. book 111) as his source for the story (cf. also Gel. 15.18.1–3; Cass. Dio 41.61.4–5; *Obsequens* 65; *Comm. Bern.* on Luc. 7.192). Lucan suppresses Cornelius' name, instead drawing the reader's attention to his vatic role (192 *augur*), location (192–4) and prophetic speech (195–6), which Lucan has edited and expanded ('Νικᾶς, ὦ Καῖσαρ' 'You are victorious, O Caesar', Plut. *Caes.* 47; Gel. 15.18.3 *postea subito exclamavit Caesarem uicisse*, 113–14n.). Lines 185–213 are structured around alternating global and local geographies and culminate with important reflections on the immortal fame of the subject matter and its ability to stir the emotions of its audience. At 185–91 the narrator progresses from the prodigies affecting the Pompeians in Greece, via the general human capacity for divination, to the unknown sense of grief affecting Romans throughout the empire; lines 192–200 recount the augury of Cornelius; at 201–4 the narrator reflects on the unique capacity of Pharsalus for generating worldwide prodigies; at 205–13 total geography leads to the whole of time: the eternal fame of Lucan's heroes – whether achieved by their own reputation or by his poetic endeavours – and the emotional and partisan impact of his subject matter on its readers.

Lucan's narrator (esp. as poetic *uates*) and Cornelius are aligned and in competition as readers of the signs of Pharsalus, whether these signs are conceived of as supernatural contemporary responses dislocated in space from the battle, or as narrative, poetic and historiographical traditions developing over time (Leigh 1997a: 26). Both Cornelius and Lucan retell the events of Pharsalus with a commitment to vivid narration (210–13; cf. Gel. 15.18.2 (on Cornelius) *proinde ut si ipse in proelio uersaretur, coram uidere sese uociferatus est*: Leigh 1997a: 10–13). While Cornelius' ἐνάργεια allows his audience to transcend the geographical space separating them from the battle, Lucan's bridges the time dividing his reading audience from his subject matter. Lucan's ἐνάργεια is, moreover, put explicitly in the service of a partisan agenda. The readers of these events will suspend their knowledge of the historical Caesarian outcome of the battle (212–13). In the illusion and the suspense of an un-predetermined outcome to Pharsalus, the audience will be astonished (212 *attonitique*); their hopes, fears and prayers will be evoked (211–12), and they will favour Pompey (213 *tibi, Magne, fauebunt*). Lucan's narrator has already modelled this emotional and partisan style of reading by explicitly praying for alternative outcomes at various points in his narrative (e.g. 4.110–20).

Lines 210–13 evoke prominent terms and effects found in theoretical models of dramatic presentation. These models are most fully developed in discussions of tragedy (e.g. Arist. *Poet.* 1449b25–29) and Hellenistic ('tragic') historiography (e.g. Polyb. 2.56.7–8; Plut. *Art.* 8.1), but their roots lie in the practice of Homeric narrative and early Greek

historiography. Lucan's *attoniti* glosses ἐκπληκτοί (*TLL* II.1154.37) from ἐκπληξίς 'shock' or 'amazement', the goal of ἐνέργεια in such discussions, while there have been a number of scholarly attempts to map (with varying precision) Lucan's phrase *spesque metusque simul perituraque uota* (211) onto Aristotle's ἔλεος καὶ φόβος ('pity and fear', 1449b27), the key emotions aroused by tragedy (e.g. Marti 1964: 181; Narducci 1979: 116; D'Alessandro Behr 2007: 78). The issue of Aristotelian influence upon these lines is both more problematic and less important than the narrator's programmatic statement of a politicized ἐνέργεια operative within his epic and designed to arouse the passions of its readers. Such an arousal of pleasure and fear played an important role in the Stoic view of how poetry could be a beneficial influence upon its audience (cf. e.g. Strabo 1.2.8), and this philosophical context is suggestive for Lucan's choice of emotions. Of the four species of emotions treated by Stoics (grief, fear, desire, pleasure), a direct equivalent for φόβος is provided by Lucan's *metus* (cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.7.14), and *spes* is a close match for ἐπιθυμία ('desire'), which in its Stoic definition has an emphasis on anticipation ('an irrational desire, or pursuit of an *expected* good', Ps.-Andronicus, *On Passions* 1 = *SVF* 3.391; Cic. *Tusc.* 4.7.14 (*libido*) *opinio uenturi boni, quod sit ex usu iam praesens esse atque adesse*); see De Lacey 1948; D'Alessandro Behr 2007: 78.

The closest epic antecedent to Lucan's apostrophe to the *summi homines* and to Pompey at 205–13 is Virgil's apostrophe to Nisus and Euryalus at *A.* 9.446–9 (itself drawing on the prologue to Enn. *Ann.* 16). Virgil's claim to immortalize the Trojan pair by the power of his song was motivated in part by their status as minor characters in the *Aeneid*, since the fame of its major characters was assured, and in part by the thematic importance of their futile tragedy (Hardie 1994: 153). Lucan develops Virgil's atypically subjective intervention into his own narrative to a paradoxical extreme, by apostrophizing the major characters of his poem. A resulting implication of this adaptation is his extension of Virgil's qualification at *A.* 9.446 *si quid mea carmina possunt* into the notion that Lucan's heroes might achieve *fama* altogether independently of his poem (208). Within *BC* the apostrophe to Pompey must also be balanced with the apostrophe to Caesar at 9.980–6 (Bernstein 2011: 268–9). There, omitting any reservations regarding his own poetic legacy (as at 208–9), Lucan promises to Caesar immortality of the kind conferred by Homeric song and closely associates his own destiny with that of Caesar (9.986–7 *uenturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra | uiuet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aeuo*). At the core of all three apostrophes, Virg. *A.* 9.446–9, here and 9.980–6, is the Homeric notion that the only lasting result of heroic struggle and death is immortal fame. On these lines see esp. Masters 1994: 158–63; Leigh 1997a: 6–19, 30–40; D'Alessandro Behr 2007: 76–8; Ormand 2010: 327–30.

**185–6 quid mirum populos quos lux extrema manebat | lymphato trepidasse metu:** *populos* are the nations under Pompey's command (56n.; cf. 89–90 *populos . . . lux . . . nouissima*). Seneca (*Ep.* 85.27) states that the *sapiens* will consider all of life's afflictions *inter lymphatos metus*. Here *lymphato trepidasse metu* restates 127 (*castra*) *trepido confusa tumultu* and adds to it nuances of prophetic possession (Sen. *Tro.* 34 (Cassandra) *ore lymphato furens*). *lux extrema* 'last day'; cf. 4.483 *extremae momentum abrumper lucis* (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.1911.13–22).

**186–7 praesaga malorum | si data mens homini est?** Cf. 2.14–15 *sit caeca futuri | mens hominum fati*; Virg. *A.* 10.843 *praesaga mali mens*; Sen. *Thy.* 957–8 *mittit luctus signa futuri | mens ante sui praesaga mali*; informing these and Lucan is the tragic notion, as at e.g. Aech. *Pers.* 10–11 *κακόμαντις . . . θυμός* 'the heart prophetic of disaster' (Harrison 1991: 271). Here the prophetic capacity of the mind is placed first for emphasis. The poet alludes to the Stoic position, that foreknowledge of the future is a benefaction from god; in *BC* this gift is reconfigured as a curse: see 2.4–6 and cf. Roche 2009: 34 with references.

**187–8 Tyrii qui Gadibus hospes | adiacet** 'the Roman visitor who lives near Tyrian Gades' (*OLD* *adiaceo* 2); *hospes*, modified by 188 *Romanus*, is subject of both *adiacet* and *bibit*. Gades (mod. Cadiz), a colony of Tyre, is proverbially the end of the earth, as at Cic. *Dom.* 80 (N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.6.1).

**188 Armeniumque bibit Romanus Araxen:** a venerable epic way of identifying the inhabitants of a country (Hom. *Il.* 2.825 (Trojans) *πίνοντες ὕδωρ μέλαν Αἰσθήποιο* 'drinking the dark waters of Aesepus'). The notion of a Roman drinking from a river so far from Italy perhaps evokes in particular the *adynata* of Verg. *Ecl.* 1.62 *aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim*; as in the *Eclogues*, the foreigner is juxtaposed with the river's name. The Araxes (mod. Aras) symbolized Roman territorial ambitions at Prop. 3.12.8; at Virg. *A.* 8.728 it is the finale of the vision of empire on the shield.

**189 sub quocumque die, quocumque est sidere mundi** 'beneath whatever region of the sky, beneath whatever constellation he is' (*OLD* *dies* 2b; *sidus* 5b); expanding parallel clauses in anaphora insist upon geographic totality. Housman drew too fine a distinction in taking *die* as latitude and *sidere mundi* as longitude.

**190–1 maeret et ignorat causas animumque dolentem | corripit, Emathiis quid perdat nescius arui:** four short clauses of increasing length, developing through chiasmus of verb and object in the second and third clause. Parataxis masks the concessive relationship of *ignorat causas* to *maeret* and



the causal relationship of *nescius* to *animum* . . . *corripit. ignorat causas* recalls the language of political or historical analysis: cf. Cic. *Phil.* 8.7 (on this civil war) *ignoro causam, detestor exitum*. For the narrator's ignorance of *causae* see 19–23n. *animumque dolentem* | *corripit* 'rebukes his grieving soul' (*OLD corripio* 6). *Emathiis* and *aruus* are displaced from the neutral position within their clause (*nescius quid aruus Emathiis perdat*) to the main caesura and line ending, thus momentarily refocusing attention from the geographic totality of the preceding lines to the site of the battle. For *quid perdat nescius*, indirect question with *nescius* (*OLD* 1c), cf. Pers. 3.33 (on Natta's lack of self-knowledge) *nescit quid perdat*.

**192–3 Euganeo . . . augur** | **colle:** *Euganeo* placed first signals another geographical shift, from Pharsalus to northern Italy. Cornelius' status as augur (in lieu of his name) and the position he takes to conduct the augury are in the most conspicuous positions in their line. The 'Euganean Hill' is near Patavium. *Euganeus*, a recherché synonym for *Patavinus*, describes the indigenous inhabitants of the area: cf. Liv. 1.1.3 (*Euganei*) *qui inter mare Alpesque incolebant*.

**192 si uera fides memorantibus:** evoking the concerns of historiography in the manner of Livy (6.1.2 (written records) *una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum*) in a highly Livian context (see 185–213n.).

**193 Aponus terris ubi fumifer exit:** the Virgilian compound *fumifer* describes the steam (*OLD fumus* 2) rising from the thermal springs of the Aponus.

**194 atque Antenorei dispergitur unda Timau:** Lucan's (apparent) coinage *Antenoreus* points to Virg. *A.* 1.242–9 where, in the context of Antenore's foundation of Padua, the Timavus is described as debouching into the sea *per ora nouem* (1.245, cf. *dispergitur*, used of the river Gyndes diverted into channels at Sen. *Dial.* 5.21.3). Serv. on Virg. *A.* 1.242 makes clear the central importance of augury in Antenore's foundation of Patavium and in its local cult (Leigh 1997a: 9 n. 1). Lucan's geography is inexact: the Timavus enters the Adriatic between Aquileia and Tergeste (see Clausen on Virg. *Ecl.* 8.6); he is misled by *A.* 1.247 *hic*: see Austin 1971: 94–5.

**195 uenit summa dies, geritur res maxima:** Cornelius makes his vatic utterance in language that is monumental in its asyndetic simplicity, metre and arrangement: two superlatives arranged in chiasmus with their nouns; both verbs are simple in form (cf. 131 *aduenisse diem*) and put first for emphasis: 'it has come', 'it is being decided'; *uenit* is further emphasized as the first full foot. It is moreover authoritative in its source: cf. Virg. *A.* 2.324–5 (Panthus) '*uenit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus* | *Dardaniae*'. The Virgilian intertext imports the finality of the state's



destruction; its Lucanian context typically expands the original civic horizons of its model to envelop the Roman world in cataclysm. For *res maxima* cf. e.g. Liv. 23.16.16 (Nola) *siue tanta siue minor uictoria fuit, ingens eo die res ac nescio an maxima illo bello gesta sit*.

**196 impia concurrunt Pompei et Caesaris arma:** *impius* – denoting the dereliction of divinely ordained duty (*OLD*) – is the classic civil war adjective: e.g. Virg. A. 6.612–13 (the damned in Tartarus) *quique arma secuti | impia*. The phrase *impia arma* gathers emphasis from the separation of adjective and noun into the initial and terminal positions in the line, where both words constitute whole feet. The hyperbaton is itself heightened by the slow progression through the molossus *concurrunt*, mirrored after the caesura in the slow sequence *Pompei et*. The genitives *Pompei et Caesaris* ‘correct’ Cornelius’ (historical) pro-Caesarian prophecy (185–213n.) and demolish the contested moral positions of the two sides, as had the narrator at 1.5–6 *certatum . . . | in commune nefas*.

**197–200** A tricolon crescendo, passing over the most obvious (and attested) source of the augury, the flight of birds (cf. Cass. Dio 41.61.4 ‘some birds not only announced the battle but in some sense performed it’).

**197 seu tonitrus ac tela Iouis praesaga notauit:** *praesaga* modifies both *tonitrus* and *tela*, a weightier variation on Virg. A. 10.177 *praesagi fulminis ignes*; Sen. Nat. 5.18.10 (Parthian omens of Crassus’ defeat) *praesaga fulmina*. On Jupiter and thunder see e.g. N–R on Hor. Carm. 3.3.6. *notauit* ‘gave heed to’ (*OLD* 12) is the *mot juste* for augury and divination: Cic. ND 3.14 *unde porro ista diuinitio, quis inuenit fissum iecoris, quis cornicis cantum notauit quis sortis?*, Div. 1.94.

**198–9 aethera seu totum discordi obsistere caelo | perspexitque polos** ‘or he saw that all the aether and the poles were resisting the discordant sky’; cf. 153 *totus . . . obstitit aether* and in particular the discordant astronomical energies exemplified by the reluctant sunrise at 1–3, esp. 2–3 *numquam magis aethera contra | egit equos cursumque polo rapiente*. *discors/discordia* is a key civil war term (e.g. Liv. 2.23.1 *ciuitas secum ipsa discors*; × 13 in BC) used by Lucan to denote political, natural and cosmic disorder. For *discordi . . . caelo* cf. 1.79–80 (in the conflagration) *totaque discors | machina diuolsi turbabit foedera mundi*. *perspexit* evokes both the methodical observation of physical evidence and the comprehension of its significance; it is a technical term from divination (e.g. Cic. Div. 1.131 *quid quamque rem significet, perspicere non possint?*).

**199–200 seu numen in aethere maestum | solis in obscuro pugnam pallore notauit** ‘or the mournful deity in the aether indicated battle in the

obscure dimness of the sun' (*OLD* noto 8a; 197n.: a good example of Lucan's occasional indifference to repetition: cf. Housman xxxiii). For *numen in aethere maestum*, here denoting the Stoic god (where hyperbaton allows the chiasitic alliteration *num- aeth- maes- tum*), cf. 2 *luctificus Titan* (cf. Sen. *Oed.* 2: see 1–6n.). *solis in obscuro pallore* may recall the solar eclipses at 4–6 or the diminished light at 178 *pallere diem*. The inclusion of *pugnam* inside the ablative phrase *in obscuro pallore* is mimetic of the omen's physical location; for similar phenomena see Lateiner 1990: esp. 218–22.

**201–2 dissimilem certe cunctis quos explicat egit | Thessalicum natura diem** 'nature drove on the Thessalian day [as being] without any doubt dissimilar to all the others that she unfolds'. *natura*, the governing power of the physical universe and its processes (*OLD* 4), is substituted for a more local agent, *sol* or sim., as at 3 *egit equos*; cf. Virg. *A.* 3.512 *nox Horis acta* (with Horsfall). *explicare* in this sense develops from 'unroll' (*OLD* 1b), via 'move forward by circular movement' and 'orbit' of celestial objects; Lucan extends this last (Senecan: *Dial.* 11.7.2) sense to units of time marked by such movements (*TLL* v<sup>2</sup>.1727.60–1728.60); cf. *Laus Pis.* 146 (*natura*) *explicat annum*. The predicative adjective *dissimilem*, emphasized through hyperbaton, is aligned in metre and position to the attributive *Thessalicum*. For *dies* modified by an adjective derived from a proper noun see *TLL* v<sup>1</sup>.1059.19–29; cf. esp. Liv. 6.1.11 *diem . . . Alliensem*.

**202–3 si cuncta perito | augure mens hominum caeli noua signa notas-**  
**set** 'if through a skilled augur the mind of mankind had given heed to all the strange signs in the sky' (186–7n.); cf. 2.14–15 *sit caeca futuri | mens hominum fati*, both recalling the fated destruction of Turnus at Virg. *A.* 10.501 *nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae*. *peritus* is often used of experience in divinatory contexts: *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.1502.3–15.

**204 spectari toto potuit Pharsalia mundo:** verbs denoting possibility (also necessity, propriety and duty) may be put in the perfect or imperfect indicative in the apodosis of a contrary to fact conditional sentence (A–G §517 (c); *NLS* §200 (i)).

**205 o summos hominum:** an exclamation (A–G §397 (d)) in pity; the phrase is echoed at 583–5 when Lucan recounts the deaths of members of prominent families in the battle.

**205–6 quorum fortuna per orbem | signa dedit:** cf. 2.1–2 *manifestaque belli | signa dedit mundus*. *quorum* is to be taken with *fortuna*, not *signa* (*pace* Dilke).

**206 quorum fatis caelum omne uacauit** 'for whose fates the whole sky was left free'.

**207 haec et apud seras gentes populosque nepotum:** *haec* agrees with 210 *bella*, an extreme hyperbaton. *apud* ‘in the time of’ (*OLD* 14); *seras* ‘subsequent’ (*OLD* 3). Cf. Prop. 3.1.35 *meque inter seros laudabit Roma nepotes* (and Ov. *Pont.* 3.2.35–6); whereas Propertius’ *nepotes* are explicitly Roman, Lucan’s *seras gentes populosque nepotum* (arranged with nouns and their modifiers in chiasmus) denote future nations and people of the world (*OLD* *gens* 2, *populus* 1b). Propertius’ confidence in an immortal fame to equal that of Homer is undercut by Lucan’s qualification at 208 of a lasting fame for his heroes achieved independently of his poem (see 185–213n.). For *populosque nepotum*, a grand periphrasis unique to Lucan, cf. 8.871–2 (of Pompey’s posthumous fame) *erit Aegyptus populis fortasse nepotum | tam mendax Magni tumulo quam Creta Tonantis*.

**208–10** Cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.878–9 *ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama, | siquid habent ueri uatum praesagia, uiuam*.

**208 sua tantum uenient in saecula fama** ‘they shall come into posterity by their own fame alone’ (*OLD* *saec(u)lum* 8); cf. 8.608–9 *qua posteritas in saecula mittet | Septimium fama?* Separation of *sua* and *fama*, already emphatic, is underscored by *tantum* before the main caesura.

**209–10 siue aliquid magnis nostri quoque cura laboris | nominibus prodesse potest:** *aliquid* is accusative of extent with *prodesse* (*NLS* §3). *magnis* here implies ‘already famous’ (*OLD* *magnus* 11b; cf. Sal. *Hist.* 1.55.2 *homines maxumi nominis*); *quoque* balances 208 *tantum*. When Virgil uses *magnum nomen* of Ardea at A. 7.412 the point is that the town no longer exists (Horsfall *ad loc.*). The formulation *magnis . . . nominibus* inevitably suggests a particular concern for Pompey (made explicit at 213), the *magni nominis umbra* (1.135), whose proper commemoration is at issue at e.g. 8.793–872, 9.167–214. Both *cura* and *labor* are terms of literary criticism and self-positioning: they evoke the Alexandrian ideal of painstaking πόνος ‘work’, ‘the careful and self-denying labour that goes into the making of a good poem’ (Rosenmeyer 1969: 22); cf. e.g. Hor. *Ars* 261 on the insufficient *cura* of Ennius. *labor* comes to be a metonym for a work of poetry in Lucretius and Horace (e.g. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.224–5 with Brink; *Ciris* 99 with Lyne).

**210–14** For this effect of rhetoric on its audience cf. e.g. Cic. *de Orat.* 2.178 (*auditor*) *sic moueatur, ut impetu quodam animi et perturbatione magis quam iudicio aut consilio regatur*.

**210 cum bella legentur:** *bella* (with 207 *haec*), the first word of *BC*, may suggest a more direct claim for Lucan’s account, since ancient poems were often cited by their opening lines; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.66 *Pharsalica bella*.

**211 spesque metusque simul perituraque uota mouebunt:** *mouere* can be used absolutely of the emotional effect produced by oratory (*TLL* VIII.1542.68–75); here it takes as its object the audience's counterfactual hope, anxiety and prayers for Pompey's cause. For *spes* and *metus* as Stoic prospective passions see Leigh 1997a: 15 n. 12; 185–213n. *perituraque uota* 'prayers which will go to waste' (*OLD* *pereo* 2a); cf. Sen. *Thy.* 720–1 *non est preces | perire frustra passus*.

**212 attonitique omnes:** see 185–213n.

**212–13 ueluti uenientia fata, | non transmissa** 'what seem like destinies yet to come and not yet past'. The counterfactual nature of their engagement is emphasized by enjambment. *transmitto* of time (*OLD* 7) is first attested in Seneca.

**213 legent et adhuc tibi, Magne, fauebunt:** restating the verb from 210 before the final consolatory prediction addressed to Pompey. *adhuc* 'even in those circumstances, still' (*OLD* 5b), i.e. even though to these readers his defeat is an historical fact.

## 214–234 THE ARRANGEMENTS OF THE POMPEIAN FORCES

**214–15** Cf. Hom. *Il.* 19.362–3 (on the Greeks emerging armed for battle) αἴγλη δ' οὐρανὸν ἵκε, γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθῶν | χαλκοῦ ὑπὸ στεροπῆς 'and the gleam went up to heaven, and all the earth around laughed because of the flashing bronze'; and the adaptations at Lucr. 2.323–30, esp. 325–6 *fulgor ubi ad caelum se tollit totaque circum | aere renidescit tellus* and Virg. *G.* 2.279–83, esp. 280–2 *explicuit legio et campo stetit agmen aperto, | derectaeque acies ac late fluctuat omnis | aere renidenti tellus* (215n.).

**214 aduerso Phoebi radiatus ab ictu** 'beaming from the oncoming impact of Phoebus'. *radiatus* is deponent (*OLD* 1b; *radio* is intransitive) and so *ab* means 'from' (*OLD* 15a) rather than 'by' (referring to an agent). *ictus* of the sun's light was perhaps suggested by Ovid (*Met.* 3.183 (*nubibus infectis aduersi solis ab ictu*, 5.389 *Phoebeos submouet ictus*), although the metaphor does not originate with him (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.166.29–35). Lucan's *aduerso* is transferred (enallage) from *Phoebi* to *ictu*; the military connotation of *aduerso* . . . *ab ictu* foreshadows the oncoming battle. *radiatus* suggests a gloss on φοῖβος 'bright, radiant'; cf. Virg. *A.* 8.720 *can-dentis limine Phoebi*.

**215 descendens totos perfudit lumine colles:** spondees in the first four feet mimic an army's orderly descent (cf. 216 *non temere, ordine certo*). For *perfundere* of light cf. Lucr. 2.148 (*sol*) *perfundens omnia luce* (Lucan's use is

bolder with *miles* as subject); the liquid metaphor is also present in Virg. *G.* 2.281–2 *fluctuat . . . | aere* (214–15n.).

**216–17** *stetit ordine certo | infelix acies*: contrast Caesar's troops at 332–3 *stant ordine nullo, | arte ducis nulla, permittuntque omnia fatis. stetit* 'took up position' (*OLD* 11a). *infelix* 'ill-fated' (*OLD* 3) gains emphasis as an initial molossus. It is frequent in military contexts but more often of the general than his army before Lucan (*TLL* VII<sup>1</sup>.1363.22–35). Magnus will be *infelix* at 648 and 674: the end of his *felicitas* has been marked at 7 (see n.).

**217–23** The commanders of Pompey's forces: Lentulus on the left wing, Scipio in the centre, Domitius on the right. Our extant prose sources are Caes. *Civ.* 3.88.2–3; Plut. *Pomp.* 69.1, *Caes.* 44.4; App. *BCiv.* 2.76.316–17. All put Scipio in the centre. Caesar puts Pompey on the left and does not name a commander on the right. Plutarch puts Domitius on the left and Pompey on the right. Appian puts Domitius on the left and Lentulus on the right (the reverse of Lucan). While it is impossible to adjudicate on these divergences, several factors need consideration. Caesar's presence at Pharsalus is not necessarily decisive for the authority of his account. Plutarch used Asinius Pollio (*Pomp.* 72, *Caes.* 46; and Livy: *Caes.* 47); so too did Appian (*BCiv.* 2.70.82, here he also mentions other unnamed sources). Pollio was present at Pharsalus as an officer of Caesar (Plut. *Pomp.* 72; App. *BCiv.* 2.82.346) and he famously criticized Caesar for carelessness in points of details regarding matters in which he himself had been involved (Suet. *Jul.* 56.4). Caesar's account may inadvertently report the perspective of his own right and left rather than Pompey's (Gwatkin 1956: 110), or sources may seek to exonerate Pompey by removing him from the left wing, the crucial area of weakness (Morgan 1983: 54). Finally, Pompey may have been present on a wing despite its designation to a commander, just as Caesar was on the right with P. Sulla (*Caes. Civ.* 3.89.3; Gwatkin 1956: 111 n. 6).

**217–18** *cornus tibi cura sinistri, | Lentule: cura* 'command' (*OLD* 7). L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus (*RE*s.v. 'Cornelius' 218; *MRR* II.276) was consul in 49 with M. Claudius Marcellus (Hirt. *Gal.* 8.50.3; Suet. *Caes.* 29.2). He left Rome in January and went to Greece with Pompey. He brought two new legions from Asia (*Caes. Civ.* 3.4.1) – where the senate had sent him as governor – to Dyrrachium (cf. Luc. 5.15–64; Cass. Dio 41.43.2). After Pharsalus he fled (via Rhodes and Cyprus) to Egypt where he was killed, the day after Pompey's assassination (*Caes. Civ.* 3.104.3). At 8.327–455 he will demolish Pompey's proposition to seek help from Parthia.

**218–19** *cum prima, quae tum fuit optima bello, | et quarta legione*: Caesar (*Civ.* 3.88.2) puts the first and third legion on the left wing at Pharsalus.

Pompey had lent Caesar Legio I in the winter of 54/3. When in 50 the senate decreed that Caesar and Pompey should each contribute a legion for a Parthian war, Caesar was asked to return it to Italy (Caes. *Civ.* 3.88.2; Hirt. *Gal.* 8.54.1–3; App. *BCiv.* 2.29.115). *quae tum fuit* brings the reader's attention momentarily to Lucan's narrating present; it may attempt to demarcate the reputation of the first legion of 48 from that of 19 BCE which, enervated by war and elderly, suffered disgrace in Spain (Cass. Dio 54.11.3–5; Syme 1933: 15–17).

**219–20 tibi, numine pugnax | aduerso Domiti:** the vocative address *pugnax* . . . *Domiti* is repeated from 2.479 (the metre will admit only the vocative and contracted genitive of *Dōmitius*); his epithet *pugnax* (cf. Homeric *μαχητής*) will be reprised at 600. *numine pugnax | aduerso* looks to his death at Pharsalus (597–616). L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (great-great-grandfather of the emperor Nero) was a long-standing and inept opponent of Caesar (*RE* 27; *MRR* II.277). In 58 he was deterred from his threats to prosecute Caesar. In 56 Pompey and Crassus checked his ambitions for the consulship of 55 and his plan to recall Caesar from Gaul. His consulship in 54 was embroiled in scandal. He was reconciled with Pompey in 52 and named Caesar's successor in Gaul in 49 (Caes. *Civ.* 1.6.5). His efforts in the civil war were energetic but ineffectual. In February 49 he surrendered to Caesar at Corfinium and was pardoned (Caes. *Civ.* 1.15–23; see Luc. 2.478–525). He helped defend Massilia against the Caesarians (Lucan omits any mention of him at 3.298–762), but fled to Greece before its capture (Caes. *Civ.* 1.34.2, 1.36.1–2, 1.56–9, 2.3–7, 2.22.2–4).

**220 dextri frons tradita Martis:** *frons*, the technical military term ('the front of an army in battle array', *OLD* 6a), is joined to a classic high-register metonym for war, *Mars* (111n.), here used more concretely of an army (*OLD* 7).

**221–2 at medii robur belli fortissima densant | agmina** 'most courageous columns closely packed the main strength at the middle of the army' (*OLD* *robur* 8). *bellum* stands for *exercitus* by metonymy, a poeticism (*TLL* II.1832.7–46). Their densely packed arrangement reminds the reader of the poem's fascination with dying or falling in constricted spaces or groups: cf. 2.203–4 (Sullan victims), 3.444–5 (trees cut down), 4.781–7 (Curio's men).

**222–3 quae Cilicum terris deducta tenebat | Scipio:** Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (*MRR* II.260, 275) was an entrenched opponent of Caesar from 52, in which year Pompey married his daughter, Cornelia, and he became Pompey's colleague as consul. He proposed the final ultimatum in 49 (Caes. *Civ.* 1.1–2). Before Pharsalus he was proconsul in Syria, where he was acclaimed *imperator*; he brought ships and troops

levied in Syria and Asia to Greece (Caes. *Civ.* 1.6.5, 3.31–3). *Cilicum terris deducta*: Caesar (*Civ.* 3.88.3) puts Syrian legions in the centre with Scipio and a *Ciliciensis legio* on the right wing with Afranius' Spanish cohorts. *deducere* is the standard military term (*OLD* 1a; *TLL* v<sup>1</sup>.274.63–275.19). *tenebat* 'had under his command' (*OLD* 9c).

**223 Scipio, miles in hoc, Libyco dux primus in orbe** 'Scipio, in this region a soldier, but in Libya chief commander' (Braund). Lucan's attention to individual generals ends with a whole, end-stopped line comprising Scipio's enjambed name and an adjectival phrase with pauses at the first foot diaeresis and main caesura. *in hoc*: sc. *orbe* 'region of the world' (6n.). After Pharsalus Scipio fled to Africa, where he received overall command of the republican forces in 47 (Liv. *per.* 113; *B. Afr.* gives a detailed narrative of his campaigns); the epithet also suggests for Scipio the tradition of the good general who is both *dux* and *miles* (87–8n.).

**224 at iuxta fluuios et stagna undantis Enipei**: on the condition of the river cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.88.6 *dextrum cornu eius riuus quidam impeditis ripis muniebat*; Front. 2.3.22 (Enipeus) *et alueo suo et alluuiie regionem impedi-erat*. The Enipeus was not necessarily overflowing: Pelling 1973: 256 n. 54 argues that *stagna* means 'pools along its bed'. The surging Enipeus (116n.; *OLD* *undo* 1a) enacts a long-established symbol of epic poetry (Virg. *G.* 3.28–9 *undantem bello magnumque fluentem* | *Nilum* with Thomas; Barchiesi 2001: 51–5), as the narrative moves to its most 'essential' subject matter, battle (cf. 116n.). *Enipei* is trisyllabic through synizesis of *-ei*.

**225–6 Cappadocum montana cohors et largus habenae | Ponticus ibat eques**: later sources report that Pompey posted 600 cavalry on his right flank near the river (Fron. *Str.* 2.3.22; Eutr. 6.20.4; Orosius 6.15.23). Both Cappadocia and Pontus had become client kingdoms in Pompey's eastern settlement; both territories were renowned for their horses and cavalry. *montana cohors* is a reference to the Taurus mountain range in southern Cappadocia (*OCD*s.v. 'Taurus mountain range'). *largus habenae* 'slack with the rein' (*OLD* *largus* 1b; cf. Sil. 7.696 *effusa largus habena*); the genitive is an extension of the genitive of fulness (*NLS* §73.3).

**226 sicci sed plurima campi**: echoed at 854 *nondum siccus hoc sanguine campos*.

**227–8 tetrarchae regesque tenent magnique tyranni | atque omnis Latio quae seruit purpura ferro**: line 227 ascends through terms of increasing power to the catch-all periphrasis of 228, which occupies the entire line and subordinates the whole group to Roman 'armed might', described by the metonym *ferrum* (*OLD* 6). *seruit purpura ferro* 'the purple subject to the sword'. *purpura* denotes kings by metonymy: it describes their purple-dyed



garments (*OLD* 3b); *seruit purpura* is thus an oxymoron. *omnis* and *Latio* are each separated in emphatic hyperbaton from their nouns. *tetrarches* is very rare in verse (here and at Hor. *S.* 1.3.12) and typically paired with *reges* in prose (e.g. Sal. *Cat.* 20.7).

**229–32** *illuc, inde* and *illic* all refer to the fields of Pharsalus referred to at 226 (Franken). This is a more compressed sequence than 224–8; here movement to (229 *illuc*), from (230–1 *inde . . . | inde*) and on (232 *illic*) the plain gives variety to an itemized list illustrating the pan-Mediterranean nature of Pompey's allies.

**229–30** *illuc et Libye Numidas et Creta Cydonas | misit*: Juba, an hereditary ally of Pompey, was the king of Numidia; a mini-catalogue of his forces is at 4.666–86. Lucan uses the Greek nominative *Libye* (since *Libya* does not scan) but varies in the oblique cases. Cydonea was a city on the north coast of Crete; here its inhabitants are a metonym for 'Cretan' (cf. Virg. *A.* 12.858 (*sagittam*) *Cydon, telum immedicabile, torsit*); for Pompey's Cretan archers see 3.184–6 (and 141–2n.).

**230** *Ityraeis cursus fuit inde sagittis*: the Ityraei (from Northern Palestine) were famed as archers (Virg. *G.* 2.448). Pompey compelled them to pay tribute in 63 (Jos. *Ant.* 14.38–9). For *cursus* of an arrow's flight cf. Man. 1.342; also Sen. *Ben.* 2.17.3 (*pila*) *cursum suum seruat*.

**231** *inde, truces Galli, solitum prodistis in hostem*: Caesar is their 'accustomed enemy' from the ten years of his campaigns in Gaul. Two Allobrogian chieftains had deserted from Caesar to Pompey (Caes. *Civ.* 3.59–60, 3.84). The military use of *prodeo* (+ *in* or *ad* with acc.) is very common in historiography (*TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.1597.55–75). For the Gauls as *truces* see e.g. Liv. 6.28.6 *species . . . truces Gallorum*; Ov. *Fast.* 6.351 *trucibus . . . Gallis*.

**232** *illic pugnaces commouit Hiberia caetras* 'there Iberia shook its aggressive shields'. For the action cf. Petr. 89.61 *commouent orbes manu | bellumque sumunt*. The *caetra*, a small round shield with a central iron boss, is only here in Lucan (cf. Virg. *A.* 7.732 *laeuas caetra tegit*). *caetrati* were among the Spanish troops of Afranius and Petreius (Caes. *Civ.* 1.39.1, 1.48.7).

**233–4** *eripe . . . triumphos*: the apostrophe to Magnus simultaneously concludes the section 224–34 on his foreign allies, the panel 214–34 on the arrangement of Pompey's forces, and the larger section 1–234, which focuses mainly on Pompey. For the sentiments cf. 3.296–7 *acciperet felix ne non semel omnia Caesar, | uincendum pariter Pharsalia praestitit orbem*. Here *eripe uictori gentes* is a terse paradox: the verb suggests plundering (*TLL* v<sup>2</sup>.792.7–8) or snatching from danger (*OLD* 5), but the longer following



clause elaborates that the nations of the world will be saved from the victorious Caesar only by their death at Pharsalus. With *sanguine mundi* | *fuso* cf. 6.583–4 (Erichtho at Pharsalus) *usuraque mundi* | *sanguine. semel totos consume triumphos* ‘exhaust all your triumphs at a single time’; *triumphi* are used for the nations over whom Caesar might triumph, as at 2.644 (Pompey of nations over whom he has triumphed) ‘*omnes redeant in castra triumphi*’.

## 235–249 CAESAR SEES THE BATTLE OFFERED

**235–9** Caesar, on the verge of striking camp, suddenly sees the Pompeian forces descending to the plain.

**235 illo forte die:** for the transitional device cf. e.g. Virg. *A.* 8.102 *forte die . . . illo rex Arcas*; Liv. 22.15.11 *eo forte die Minucius se coniunxerat Fabio*. *forte* denotes coincidence but also suggests Caesar’s monopoly of *fortuna*. **statione relicta:** cf. Virg. *A.* 9.222 *statione relicta*. At *Civ.* 3.85.3 Caesar says only *signo iam protectionis dato tabernaculisque detensis*. *statio* is closely related to *uigilia* and *custodia* (cf. Liv. 28.1.8 (*castra*) *stationibus uigiliis omni iusta militari custodia tuta et firma esse*; TLL IV.1560.69–70).

**236 ad segetum raptus moturus signa:** cf. 98n. Lucan suppresses two of Caesar’s three reasons for striking camp at *Civ.* 3.85.2 *ut mouendis castris pluribusque adeundis locis commodiore re frumentaria uteretur, simulque in itinere ut aliquam occasionem dimicandi nancisceretur et insolitum ad laborem Pompei exercitum cotidianis itineribus defatigaret*.

**236–7 repente | conspicit in planos hostem descendere campos:** picking up their highly visible descent at 214–15. *repente* (a *hapax* in Lucan) is an elevated synonym for *subito* (Kraus on Liv. 6.4.4): poets except for Lucretius tend to prefer *subito* (Axelson 1945: 32–3). *in planos . . . campos* compresses details in Caesar: *Civ.* 3.85.3 *paulo ante extra cotidianam consuetudinem longius a uallo esse aciem Pompei progressam, ut non iniquo loco posse dimicari uideretur*.

**238–9 oblatumque uidet uotis sibi mille petitem | tempus, in extremos quo mitteret omnia casus** ‘and he perceived that on offer was the occasion, sought by him in a thousand prayers, on which he might stake all on a final gamble’ (adapting Quintilian); lit. ‘send everything into its final hazard’ (*OLD* *mitto* 15c, *casus* 8). The image seems to evoke casting dice (cf. *OLD* *mitto* 9b), suitable for Caesar: cf. Suet. *Jul.* 32.1 (Caesar at the Rubicon) ‘*Iacta alea est*.’ The relative clause expresses purpose (in secondary sequence after an historic present). Enjambed *tempus* frames the main clause with *oblatum*, which itself frames the line with *petitem*. Each

item is emphatic; the two participles build anticipation of their noun. *uidet* (here and at 247) describes Caesar's appreciation of the event's significance (*OLD* 14b; a near-synonym of *intellegerē*. *TLL VII*<sup>1</sup>.2100.56–60; contrast *conspicere*, used of the simple act of seeing). *uotis sibi mille petitem* may rework Caes. *Civ.* 3.85.4 (Caesar) '*semper depoposcimus*'; Caesar will recast these sentiments in direct speech at 251.

**240 aeger quippe morae flagransque cupidine regni:** cf. Virg. *A.* 1.208 (Aeneas) *curisque ingentibus aeger*; Luc. 6.423 (Sextus) *impatiensque morae uenturisque omnibus aeger*. *quippe* introduces a new sentence to explain 238–9; *morae* is genitive of reference (*OLD aeger* 3a; *NLS* §73.6, A–G §349 (d)). *flagransque cupidine regni* suggests Caesar as a second Hannibal: cf. Liv. 21.10.4 (Hanno, on Hannibal) '*iuuenum flagrantem cupidine regni*'.

**241–2 coeperat exiguu tractu ciuilia bella | ut lentum damnare nefas** 'he had begun to condemn this civil war of brief duration as a long-drawn-out evil'; *tractu* 'period of time' (*OLD* 8b) is ablative of description; *bellum trahere* is a standard expression for delaying a war (296n.). Manic haste is a hallmark of Caesar's characterization in *BC*: it is established in his introduction and comparison to a lightning bolt at 1.143–57 (see Roche 2009: 189–94). The poet contrasts his own point of view (*exiguu tractu*) with Caesar's (*lentum*), but inserts his own equivalence between civil war and *nefas* (cf. e.g. 1.37 *scelera ipsa nefasque*) – which Caesar does not make elsewhere – into Caesar's reported speech: the only *nefas* claimed by Caesar in the poem is the felling of the Massilian grove at 3.437. Elsewhere he labels as *nefas* imagined crimes against him in the Saepta (306) and Ptolemy's crime against Pompey (9.1088). Both *exiguu tractu* and *lentum* . . . *nefas* are unique collocations.

**242–3 discrimina postquam | aduentare ducum supremaque proelia uidit:** cf. 6.415–16 *summique grauem discriminis horam | aduentare*. Caesar here sees the battle as a test to differentiate himself and Pompey (*OLD discrimen* 3b); Pompey at 108–9 described the war as a *mundi discrimen*. Here *discrimina* may hint at *crimina* (cf. 551 *hic sunt tua crimina*, Caesar); *aduentare* often describes the advance of enemy forces (*OLD* 1b). *-que* is epexegetic (*OLD* 6a). *supremus* 'decisive' of battles is common in historiography (*OLD* 6). For *uidit* see 238–9n.

**244 casuram <et> fatis sensit nutare ruinam** 'and felt the destined downfall about to totter' (Braund); *nutare* 'to sway as if about to fall' (*OLD* 4b, cf. 6.136 *quassae nutant turres lapsumque minantur*): the phrase is suggestive of the Stoic cataclysm and the poem's pervasive imagery of architectural ruination. *ruinam* sc. 'of all things' (*ASL*), cf. 4.393 *mundi nutante ruinā*. *et* is a conjecture found in some codices; it clarifies that this is part of the temporal clause.

**245–8** Caesar experienced similar moments of hesitation at the Rubicon (1.192–5; 246n.) and at Ariminum (1.262–4, esp. 262 *dubiaeque in proelia menti*). Caesar's fear in the besieged palace at Alexandria seems to be developed from the present description: 10.449–53 *audax . . . nuper qui . . . | non timuit fatumque sibi promisit iniquum, expauit seruire nefas*.

**245 illa quoque in ferrum rabies promptissima:** cf. 1.147 (of Caesar) *numquam temerando parcere ferro*. *illa* is contemptuous, a reference to a well-known attribute (*OLD* 4c). *promptissima* 'most readily inclined to' with *in* + acc. (*OLD* *promptus* 5a). *rabies* (51n.) is attributed to Caesar by Pompey (2.544) and by the poet again at 551 and 557; the Caesarians Scaeva (6.224) and Crastinus (474) also possess it. It describes civil war more generally at 1.666, 5.264 (by Caesar's mutinying troops), 6.63 and 10.71. Pompey does not possess *rabies* in the poem.

**246 languit** 'waned' (here *languit*; elsewhere in Lucan with consonantal *u*); the atypical decline in Caesar's intensity is held over in enjambment and emphasized by a strong pause at the end of the first foot. Cf. 1.194 *languor in extrema tenuit uestigia ripa*.

**246–7 et casus audax spondere secundos | mens stetit in dubio** 'his mind, so reckless to guarantee success, stopped in doubt' (for *casus . . . secundos* cf. Nep. *Dat.* 5.4); *audax* + inf. is a poeticism (*TLL* II.1248.47–52). Caesar's audacity is typical of the overreacher: cf. Enn. *Ann.* 401 *Hannibal audaci cum pectore*; Sal. *Cat.* 5.4 *Catilinae animus audax*; see also Virg. *A.* 7.475 *Turnus Rutulos animis audacibus implet*. Caesar gives an extravagant assurance of his own good fortune to Amyclas at 5.581–3.

**247–8 quam nec sua fata timere | nec Magni sperare sinunt** 'which neither his own fate permits to fear nor Magnus' [fate permits] to hope'. Caesar is caught between indulging in either fear or hope, the latter prevented by the success that Pompey had enjoyed up until this moment. At 85–6 Pompey's comparison of their respective fates was more pessimistic. For the comparison of contrary fates, cf. Virg. *A.* 1.239, 7.293–4 (both quoted at 85–6n.); Lucan may have in mind the notion of 'weighing' contrary fates, as at Virg. *A.* 12.725–7.

**248 formidine mersa** 'with his dread suppressed'; cf. Virg. *A.* 1.209 *spem uultu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem*. Pompey also suppresses his fear to exhort the soldiers at 341 *premit inde metus*.

**249 prosilit hortando melior fiducia uulgo:** *prosilit*, uniquely used of a state of mind, personifies Caesar's confidence and sets it in contrast to the enforced downward movement of his *formido*; it may further suggest Caesar 'leaping up' to address his troops. The phrase *hortando . . . uulgo* is dative with *melior* (A–G §505 (a)). For *uulgo* used of the soldiers in an

army see Virg. *A.* 11.451–2; Ov. *Met.* 13.1; Smolenaars 1994: 63 compares Homeric λαός, used in contrast to the leaders of the army.

## 250–329 CAESAR EXHORTS HIS SOLDIERS

This is Caesar's third speech to his soldiers in the poem; it should be compared to his speech at Ariminum at 1.299–351 and his response to their mutiny at 5.319–64. The notion of his selfless commitment to their just reward – his willingness to forgo his own reward for theirs – was first raised at Ariminum (1.340–6), confuted at Placentia (5.357), and is now redeveloped here (264–9). Harking back to his speech at Ariminum are the themes of the soldiers' service in Gaul (286–7n.) and Pompey as a general of Sulla (304–7; cf. 1.324–35); while a debate regarding the troops' role in Caesar's fortune and destiny is reprised from Placentia (250–1, 253nn.).

*Structure.* Caesar begins with the news that battle is offered and that its outcome is in the hands of the soldiers (250–3), and closes by ordering the troops to destroy their own camp (326–9). The speech is loosely arranged around the lengthy central panel at 269–94, which offers the troops an assurance of victory based upon a comparison of the respective armies: Pompey's forces are denigrated as an enervated foreign army, uninterested in the outcome of battle (269–85); by contrast Caesar has repeatedly witnessed his soldiers' courage in battle and he now recognizes their readiness for battle and victory in their faces (285–94). Before this panel, Caesar is concerned with victory: its role in determining innocence and guilt (254–63) and the rewards it will bring to the soldiers (264–9). After the central panel Caesar reflects on the needlessness of encouraging the soldiers and his own anticipation of victory (295–302); he outlines the consequences of defeat (303–17) and bids the soldiers to spare fugitives from the fight but to ignore any bonds of *pietas* in battle (318–25).

Caesar's speech is a *paraceleusis*, an exhortation to battle; its pairing with Pompey's speech at 342–82 is a typical arrangement in both historiography and epic (Albertus 1908: 25, 28–31 lists examples); indeed the speeches of Caesar and Pompey are paired in direct speech at *Caes. Civ.* 3.85.4 and 3.86.2–4. However, Lucan's speeches here and at 342–82 have little in common with their counterparts in Caesar (for Pompey's speech in Caesar see 85–127n.). Some common rhetorical elements in the pre-battle exhortation found in Caesar's speech are his denigration of a foreign enemy on ethnic grounds (269–70, 272–3nn.); his role as 'witness' to the valour of his troops (286–7n.); his reference to his own evaluative gaze over the soldiers (290–2n.); the needlessness of delaying already brave soldiers with encouragement (295–6n.); the consequences

of defeat (303–17; cf. e.g. Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.17–18, 3.2.3). Caesar's prayer before the troops (311–17; cf. Polyb. 3.44.13) and his final injunction to his troops to destroy their own camp can also each be paralleled in examples from historiography (326–9; Xen. *Anab.* 3.2.27). A significant model for Caesar's *paraceleusis* is Hannibal's speech before Ticinus in Livy (285–9, 290–2nn.), a point of reference which furthers the association of the two in the poem (Ahl 1976: 107–12; Masters 1992: 1 n. 1 with references). Albertus 1908: 28–36 offers a convenient catalogue of *paraceleusis* in ancient literature. On Caesar's speech see further Leigh 1997a: 292–306; Roller 2001: 43–5; Rolim de Moura 2010.

**250–1 o domitor mundi, rerum fortuna mearum, | miles:** the collective singular *o domitor mundi*, although unparalleled as an address to a god, nevertheless seems designed to venerate (cf. 4.110 '*o summe parens mundi*'; Sen. *Her. F.* 205 '*O magne Olympi rector et mundi arbiter*', both prayers to Jupiter). For the phrase cf. 8.553 (the poet on Pompey) *domitor mundi*; 9.1014 (Ptolemy's *satelles* to Caesar) '*terrarum domitor, Romanae maxime gentis*'. *rerum fortuna mearum* 'destiny of my circumstances' (*OLD fortuna* 8c), applied to those who bring or cause good fortune (*TLL* VI.1181.58–61); the phrase is explained at 253. Caesar credits an important attribute of the general (*OLD fortuna* 4a; Weinstock 1971: 112–27) to his soldiers, who had complained at 5.291–2 '*ingrato meritorum iudice uirtus | nostra perit: quidquid gerimus fortuna uocatur*'; he had responded at 5.327 '*tot red-det Fortuna uiros quot tela uacabunt*'.

**251 adest totiens optatae copia pugnae:** cf. Virg. *A.* 10.279 (Turnus) '*quod uotis optastis adest, perfringere dextra*'. Harrison *ad loc.* compares Hom. *Il.* 16.207–8 (Achilles to the Myrmidons) 'νῦν δὲ πέφανται | φυλόπιδος μέγα ἔργον' 'but now has appeared before you a great work of war' and Liv. 34.13.5 (Cato's opening to his soldiers) '*tempus*' inquit '*quod saepe optastis uenit*'; Goebel 1981: 83 calls such statements the 'wished-for-day topos'. *copia pugnae* appears in Livy (3.60.8, 4.18.3, 40.30.8) and Virgil: *A.* 9.720 (the Latins) *undique conueniunt, quoniam data copia pugnae*.

**252 nil opus est uotis:** cf. 238–9 *oblatumque uidet uotis sibi mille petitum | tempus*. **iam fatum accersite ferro:** the notion that courage is more important than prayer in battle suggests the Caesarians as *contemptores deorum*: cf. Virg. *A.* 10.773 (Mezentius) '*dextra mihi deus et telum*'. Caesar's *fatum accersite ferro* could easily read as an incitement to suicide: cf. 4.484 (Vulteius) '*accersas dum fata manu*'; the object of *accersere* in this sense is frequently death (*OLD accerso* 5a; *TLL* II.453.20–9).

**253 in manibus uestris, quantus sit Caesar, habetis:** cf. 5.293 (Caesar's soldiers) '*nos fatum sciat esse suum*'; Caesar had debunked this notion

at Placentia: 5.325–7, 5.335–45, 5.351–7. *quantus sit Caesar* ‘how great Caesar will be’ (indirect question in primary sequence).

**254–6** A simple main clause (cf. 195 *uenit summa dies*) to the main caesura, amplified by three relative clauses. Martial’s tribute to Lucan at 7.21.1 begins by quoting this first clause.

**254–5** *haec est illa dies mihi quam Rubiconis ad undas | promissam memini*: there was no such promise of a climactic encounter at 1.183–227. This ‘memory’ may be a polemical correction of the tradition in which Caesar vacillated at the Rubicon (Plut. *Caes.* 32.5–8; Suet. *Jul.* 31.2).

**255** *cuius spe mouimus arma*: *mouimus* ‘we stirred up’ (*OLD* 17b). The plurals *mouimus* and 256 *distulimus* are literal (not singular for plural): they are used for rhetorical effect by Caesar since he includes his soldiers as agents in actions that he alone has taken. For Caesar’s hope cf. 1.146 *acer et indomitus, quo spes quoque ira uocasset*, 6.29–30 *hic audiam belli rapuit spes improba mentem | Caesaris*.

**256** *in quam distulimus uetitos remeare triumphos* (lit.) ‘until which we delayed our triumphs which were forbidden to return’ (*OLD in* 13b); i.e. ‘the return in triumph that was denied us’; cf. Virg. *A.* 2.95 (Sinon) ‘*si patrios umquam remeassem uictor ad Argos*’. The effect of Lucan’s phrase is to personify triumphs themselves, thus creating the paradox of triumphs in exile. In Caesar’s rhetoric his Gallic triumph has been denied to him by the machinations of his enemies at Rome. It was never formally sought nor denied since the civil war intervened; his entry into Rome in April 49 will have legally invalidated his claim: Weinstock 1971: 61–4.

**257–8** These lines are not in the majority of MSS (**G** has them; 256 and 259 are also missing in **P**). Oudendorp removed them on the grounds that they interrupt Caesar’s focus on himself in this section and that the prospect on offer to his soldiers of becoming *coloni* here is inconsistent with his promise to them of *ius in omnes* at 265; he reasoned that they had been introduced under the influence of 1.340–6, where the denial of a triumph and lands for the veterans are paired.

**259–60** Caesar’s offer of an answer to Lucan’s unanswerable question – 1.126–7 *quis iustius induit arma | scire nefas* – turns on the normative moral potential of victory: cf. 1.2 *iusque datum sceleri* and see Roller 2001: 43–5 ‘Caesar declares here that he is fighting Pompey for control of the content and application of the Roman ethical vocabulary.’

**259–60 quis iustius arma | sumpserit:** an indirect question dependent on *probet*.

**260 haec acies uictum factura nocentem est:** on the capacity of the war to change the moral status of its participants cf. 1.203 (Caesar to Patria) ‘*ille erit ille nocens, qui me tibi fecerit hostem*’ and 1.279 (Curio to Caesar) ‘*tua nos faciet uictoria ciues*’. Elsewhere this transformative power is ascribed to participation in the war more generally: 2.259 (Brutus to Cato) ‘*facient te bella nocentem*’, 2.228 (Cato to Brutus) ‘*crimen erit superis et me fecisse nocentem*’.

**261 si pro me patriam ferro flammisque petitis:** cf. 79–80 (Cicero to Pompey) ‘*si duce te iusso, si nobis bella geruntur*’. *ferro flammisque* varies an alliterative cliché; cf. e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 2.1.3 (of Catiline) *uobis atque huic urbi ferro flammaque minitantem*.

**262 nunc pugnate truces gladioque exsoluite culpam:** the exhortation to fight savagely (adjective for adverb) is unique; *trux* more commonly describes the soldier’s face before battle (as at 290–2 and e.g. Virg. *A.* 10.447 (Pallas)). *gladioque exsoluite culpam* ‘and put an end to guilt with your sword’ (*OLD ex(s)oluo* 3). *gladio* is pushed forward emphatically as the primary vehicle for Caesar’s crisp paradox; cf. Sil. 11.199 (Decius) ‘*ferro purgate nefas*’ where fierce fighting will expiate Capua’s treason: here the victor will establish what is and is not called treason. The MSS variants *gladios ZMP* and *culpa ZP* dull the edge of Caesar’s rhetoric; cf. 8.518–19 (Pothinus) ‘*crimen habemus | purgandum gladio*’.

**263 nulla manus, belli mutato iudice, pura est:** *pura* ‘free from the stain of crime’ (*OLD* 4) is stressed through hyperbaton; cf. 486–7; Sen. *Suas.* 6.2 (Cato) *puras a civili sanguine manus in pectus sacerrimum armauit*. *manus* is the human hand, ‘as instrument of violence (defiled by crime)’ (*OLD* 8c). *belli mutato iudice* ‘once the judge of war is changed’ (i.e. if we lose and someone other than I evaluates your actions) recalls and perhaps responds to 5.291–2 (Caesar’s troops to him) ‘*ingrato meritum iudice uirtus | nostra periit*’ (Nehrkorn 1960: 164–6). Caesar’s presentation of a claim to moral purity made contingent upon victory is one part of the poem’s overall concern with the process whereby victory legitimizes criminal behaviour (cf. 1.2 *iusque datum sceler*): ‘[t]he victor establishes himself as *iudex belli*, meaning that the allocation of value terms – including the very ones Caesar uses in this passage (*ius*, *nocens*, *culpa* and *purus*) – will be entirely at his disposal’ (Roller 2001: 44).

**264–5 non mihi res agitur, sed, uos ut libera sitis | turba, precor gentes ut ius habeatis in omnes:** *non mihi res agitur* contradicts Caesar’s rhetoric at Placentia – 5.357 ‘*iam certe mihi bella geram*’ – and develops the judicial



metaphor from 263 *belli . . . iudice* (OLD *res* 11b). Three progressively longer clauses ascend in scale from the negated individual (*non mihi*), plural pronoun (*uos*), *turba* (denoting common interests or characteristics: OLD 5a) and culminate with *gentes . . . omnes*. In 264 postponed *ut* isolates *uos* and sharpens the contrast between it and *mihi*; in 265 the separation of *gentes* from its adjective delays the grammatical resolution of the sentence until its final word. The objectives *ut libera sitis* | *turba* and *gentes . . . ius habeatis in omnes* reflect Caesar's conceit that only world-dominion will preserve his soldiers' freedom. This uncompromisingly polar vision – a closed, either/or formulation of absolute success or complete devastation – is characteristic of Caesar.

**266 ipse ego priuatae cupidus me reddere uitae:** cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.95 '*uitae me redde priori*'. *cupidus* + inf. is a poeticism (TLL IV.1426.72–9; NLS §26), the adjective here has concessive force. The line slows over the molossus *priuatae*, the key word to be developed in 267.

**267 plebeiaque toga modicum componere ciuem:** Caesar will perform *ciuitas* (OLD *compono* 10b; TLL III.2129.35–41), and thus anticipate the figure of the *ciuilis princeps* of the first century CE (see Wallace-Hadrill 1982): contrast Suet. *Dom.* 12.3 *ab inuenta minime ciuilis animi, confidens etiam et cum uerbis tum rebus immodicus*. The fullest exposition of *ciuitas* in the poem is Cato's eulogy of Pompey at 9.190–214. *plebeiaque toga* (a slightly ironic phrase in view of Caesar's patrician status) is in contrast to the toga *praetexta*, worn by holders of high office; cf. 2.18–19 *latuit plebeio tectus amictu* | *omnis honos, nullos comitata est purpura fasces* and 5.538 (Caesar) *plebeio tectus amictu*.

**268 omnia dum uobis liceant, nihil esse recuso:** *libertas*, the goal of 264, is swiftly displaced by unchecked *licentia*, the completeness of which is stressed by the postponement of *dum*, which emphasizes *omnia*. Caesar frames his own leadership as a burden he undertakes for the sake of his troops; his expressed personal preference to refuse it accords well with the imperial *recusatio*, made at an emperor's accession to render palatable his assumption of supreme power (see Huttner 2004; Béranger 1953: 137–69). *nihil esse recuso* 'there is nothing I refuse to be', i.e. 'not even your leader' (ASL is correct: *quasi cogatur, ut dux sit illis dum imperium conferre desiderat*); Caesar is not implying 'not even a king' (*pace* SB *ad loc.* on Housman *ad loc.*).

**269 inuidia regnate mea** 'rule and let the ill will be mine': epigrammatic concision closes 264–9 before the change of subject matter. *inuidia . . . mea* (ablative of attendant circumstances, NLS §47) is 'nearly a formal acceptance, in exchange for victory, of the very *nemesis inuidia* that the poem heaps upon Caesar' (Easton 2011: 350); cf. Cic. *Off.* 3.82 (on



Pompey's power and odium against Caesar) *utile ei uidebatur plurimum posse alterius inuidia*.

**269–70 nec sanguine multo | spem mundi petitis:** Caesar rings the changes on the theme of the 'bloodless victory' (cf. 92–4), here resulting not from brilliant strategy but from poor-quality opponents, and thus moves on to a new topic (269–80), Pompey's foreign forces. Comparison and denigration of the enemy on ethnic grounds is a standard rhetorical move in the pre-battle exhortation (e.g. Hdt. 9.17.4; Thuc. 5.9.1, 6.68.2, 7.5.4; Liv. 36.17.5). *spem mundi*, i.e. *spem mundi regendi*; *petitis* ascribes the ambition exclusively to the soldiers; *petimus* would have scanned identically.

**270–2 Grais delecta iuuentus | gymnasiis aderit studioque ignaua palaestrae | et uix arma ferens:** cf. 3.171 (on Pompey's forces) *proxima uicino uires dat Graecia bello*. Enjambed *gymnasiis* deflates the dignified *Grais* (as opposed to *Graecis*, see Watson on Hor. *Ep.* 10.12) along with the heroic register of *delecta iuuentus* (cf. Virg. *A.* 4.130, 8.499, 9.226). Greek athletic institutions (framing line 271, as at Man. 4.720–1 *perque coloratas subtilis Graecia gentes | gymnasium praefert uultu fortisque palastras*) were a common target of Roman moralizing invective for their purported enervating or effeminizing effect (cf. references at Galán Vioque 2002: 225–6).

**272–3 aut mixtae dissona turbae | barbaries** 'or barbaric babble of a jumbled mob' (Braund). *barbaries* 'barbarian people' (*OLD* 1a); *turbae*: genitive of material (A–G §344). Caesar echoes the end of the catalogue of Pompey's forces at 3.287–9 esp. 289–30 *tam dissona uulgi | ora*. Linguistic diversity marks the losing side at Hom. *Il.* 2.804–5, 4.437–8 (Trojans) and Virg. *A.* 8.723 (conquered nations on the shield); Liv. 30.33.12, 30.34.1, reflecting Polyb. 15.12.9 (Carthaginians at Zama).

**273–4 non illa tubas, non agmine moto | clamorem latura suum:** *agmine moto* varies the standard *agmine facto* and describes the assembled army marching into battle. Caesar's clauses expand as they move past the conventional (*tubas*; cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.21 (illustrating *contentio*) 'in proelio prae ignauia tubae sonitum perferre non potes') to the novel and the paradoxical (*clamorem . . . suum*), where the enjambed key noun *clamorem* initiates its line in a slow molossus and the reflexive adjective carrying Caesar's point is delayed to last place. *non . . . clamorem latura suum* caps 272 *uix arma ferens*; cf. Thuc. 4.126.5 (Brasidas on the Illyrian army) 'βοῆς μεγέθει ἀφόρητοι' 'the loudness of their battle cry is intolerable'. Caesar (*Civ.* 3.92.5) states that the shouting of armies before joining battle was useful for terrifying the enemy and stirring one's own men. (Lucan's) Caesar's prediction that the Pompeians would not endure the sound of their own shouting is pointed because the pre-battle cry was often taken as an index of the army's state of mind: see Oakley on Liv. 8.38.10.

**274–5 *ciuilia paucae* | *bella manus facient*:** i.e. very few of you will fight actual Roman citizens (*ciuilia* in emphatic hyperbaton); cf. 366–8n.

**275–6 *pugnae pars magna leuabit* | *his orbem populis Romanumque obteret hostem*:** a gross distortion of the status of Pompey's allies, many of whom were client kings (on which see *OCD* s.v. 'client kings'; Braund 1984). *leuabit* 'will relieve (of a burden)' (*OLD* 3); *obteret* 'crush in battle' (*OLD* 2a). *Romanum* (used objectively 'an enemy of Rome') is stressed both by position and by being superfluous to the sense of *hostem* (cf. 1.23 *nondum tibi defuit hostis*).

**277–80** The commands to go forth and conquer the world, along with the sententious paradox ending at 280, suggest an imminent conclusion to the *paraceleusis*.

**277 *ite per ignauas gentes famosaque regna*:** *ignauas* and *famosa* (*OLD* 2b) recap the point of 270–4. *gentes* is often specifically of foreign peoples (*OLD* 2). While *ite* here certainly conveys movement with hostile intent (see *OLD* 7b; cf. *Ov. Fast.* 2.207–8 *destrictis ensibus ipsi | Tyrrhenum ualido Marte per agmen eunt*), the use of *i/ite* coordinated with a second imperative (278 *et . . . prosternite*) is a very common idiom, 'go and (do something)', in which the force of *ire* is often redundant (*OLD* 10a): cf. *Prop.* 3.4.10 *ite et Romanae consulite historiae!*

**278 *et primo ferri motu prosternite mundum*:** the means of victory is made plain in consecutive long syllables and strong caesurae in the first four feet. 'First stroke' (Braund; Duff) may overtranslate *primo ferri motu* (*OLD moueo* 4a 'move purposefully'); Caesar's may rather refer hyperbolically to a victory brought about by merely brandishing the swords, cf. *Stat. Theb.* 7.442 (Phegeus' severed right arm) *illa suum terra tenet improba ferum et mouet*. For this rhetorical topic before battle cf. *Curt.* 3.10.6 (reporting Alexander's speech to his troops before Issos) *uix gladio futurum opus: totam aciem suo pauore fluctuantem umbonibus posse propelli*. *prosternere* 'defeat utterly' is a military term (*TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.2228.12–34), here extended to encompass the world and evoking 'lay prostrate (as a mark of submission)' (*OLD* 3; cf. Leigh 1997a: 80 n. 6).

**279–80 *sitque palam, quas tot duxit Pompeius in urbem | curribus, unius gentes non esse triumphi*** 'and let it be common knowledge that all the races (*tot gentes*) which Pompey led in his chariots into the city do not amount to a single triumph' (*OLD palam* 2b, *sum* 19). *triumphi* is genitive of quality (A–G §346), its separation from *unius* is emphatic. The plural *curribus* reflects the three separate occasions to which Caesar refers. The easy defeat of these foreign forces will discredit Pompey's eastern campaigns, his greatest achievement. *gentes*, the antecedent of *quas*, is

similarly delayed for emphasis; for their number (*tot*): Plin. *Nat.* 7.98 (the *praefatio* of Pompey's eastern triumph) EX ASIA PONTO ARMENIA PAPHLAGONIA CAPPADOCIA CILICIA SYRIA SCYTHIS IVDAEIS ALBANIS HIBERIA INSVLA CRETA BASTERNIS ET SVPER HAEC DE REGE MITHRIDATE ATQVE TIGRANE TRIVMPHAVIT (and Plut. *Pomp.* 45.1–5). *ducere* is the *mot juste* for leading captives in a triumph (*OLD* 7); for *Pompeius* evoking *pompa* see 9n.

**281–2 Armeniosne mouet Romana potentia cuius | sit ducis** ‘Does it affect the Armenians which leader holds *Roman* power?’ (*OLD* *moueo* 14a); for *Romana potentia* cf. Virg. *A.* 8.99; Ov. *Met.* 15.877. *Romana*, first in the indirect question, contrasts with *Armenios* to accentuate the point.

**282–3 emptum minimo uult sanguine quisquam | barbarus Hesperis Magnum praeponere rebus?** ‘Does any barbarian want to pay [lit. “it bought”], at the cost of even the smallest amount of blood, to set Magnus in authority over western affairs?’ *emptum* agrees with the clause *Hesperis Magnum praeponere rebus*; cf. Sil. 5.601–2 ‘sero emptum uolet impia Roma | non uiolasse mei corpus mucrone Sychaei’ (*TLL* v<sup>2</sup>.516.42–50). *minimo* (ablative of price) seems to pun on *Magnum*. *barbarus Hesperis* is an emotive contrast, while *Hesperis* . . . *rebus* is a variation on *rebus Romanis*. The nuance ‘western’ in *Hesperis* helps convey the indifference of an eastern soldier.

**284–5 Romanos odere omnes, dominosque grauantur, | quos nouere, magis: grauantur** ‘they feel oppressed by’ (*OLD* 4b; cf. 5.258); for further examples of *grauare* in this sense with the accusative see *TLL* vi<sup>2</sup>.2314.17–47. Cf. Virg. *A.* 1.282 *Romanos, rerum dominos*; Liv. 34.49.7 (the Aetolians on Greece) *mutatos pro Macedonibus Romanos dominos*. For the structure of Caesar's *sententia* cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.6.28 (*mala nostra*) *nunc magis hoc, quo sunt cognitiora, grauant*; on *sententiae* in *BC* see 61n.

**285–9** Cf. Liv. 21.43.17 (Hannibal to his soldiers before Ticinus) ‘non ego illud parui aestimo, milites, quod nemo est uestrum cuius non ante oculos ipse saepe militare aliquod ediderim facinus, cui non idem ego uirtutis spectator ac testis notata temporibus locisque referre sua possim decora.’

**285–6 sed me fortuna meorum | commisit manibus:** cf. 253 ‘in manibus uestris, quantus sit Caesar, habetis’. Caesar's shift in topic to the intimate familiarity he shares with his troops recalls and reverses a number of common idioms. The legions were usually said to be *in manu* ‘in the hand (i.e. control)’ (*OLD* *manus* 16c) of their commander (cf. Sal. *Cat.* 51.36 *consule, quoi item exercitus in manu sit*), just as the army was said to be entrusted (*OLD* *committo* 12) to its leader (e.g. Cic. *Man.* 47 *magnis imperatoribus . . . exercitus esse commissos*). Caesar also transforms the idiom in which one is said to entrust oneself or be entrusted to *fortuna* (e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.5.132 *se fortunae commiserunt*); on *fortuna* and Caesar see 250–1n.

**286–7** *quarum me Gallia testem | tot fecit bellis* ‘which Gaul made me a witness of in so many wars’; cf. 1.299–300 (Caesar to his troops) *‘bello- rum o socii, qui mille pericula Martis | mecum’ ait ‘experti’*. For the general as ‘witness’ of his troops cf. 6.158–9 (Scaeva) *‘peterem felicior umbras | Caesaris in uultu: testem hunc fortuna negauit’*; Liv. 21.43.17 (quoted at 285–9n.), 26.44.8 (Scipio) *testis spectatorque uirtutis atque ignauiae cuiusque adest*, 27.14.4 *Marcellus mediam aciem hortator testisque praesens firmabat*; and see Leigh 1997a: 191–233.

**287–8** *cuius non militis ensem | agnoscam?* cf. Virg. A. 2.422–3 *clipeos mentitaque tela | agnoscunt*. The ‘poetic’ *ensis* (× 55, allowing *ensifer*) is quite evenly weighted with the ‘prosaic’ *gladius* (× 44) in *BC*: cf. Virg. A., in which *ensis* occurs more than sixty times in contrast to *gladius*, which appears only five times (Lyne 1989: 101–2, 103–4; Oakley 1998: 143 on Liv. 7.10.9 gives statistics on other authors).

**288–9** *caelumque tremens cum lancea transit | dicere non fallar quo sit uibrata lacerto* ‘and when the quivering spear is flying through the sky, I shall without error say by which arm it was hurled’; cf. Sil. 9.246–7 (Hannibal) *se cognoscere iactat, | qua dextra ueniant stridentis sibila teli*. For *quo sit uibrata lacerto* cf. Ov. *Ep.* 3.125–6 *uibrata lacerto | . . . hasta*. Crastinus’ hurled *lancea* will mark the beginning of the battle at 472; this weapon is kept apart from regulation equipment at Sal. *Cat.* 56.3; here it is used as a synonym for *pilum* (cf. 140–1n.). *tremens* vividly describes the ongoing vibrations in the weapon after it is propelled; cf. 3.598 *pila sed in medium uenere trementia pectus*.

**290–2** *quod si, signa ducem numquam fallentia uestrum, | conspicio faciesque truces oculosque minaces, | uicistis*: on the general’s evaluative gaze over the troops in his pre-battle exhortation cf. Liv. 21.44.1 (Hannibal at Ticinus) *‘quocumque circumtuli oculos, plena omnia uideo animorum ac roboris’*. Caesar’s *signa numquam fallentia* ‘signs which never deceive’ (*OLD fallo* 3a) suggests the interpretation of a portent (*OLD signum* 5b; *TLL* VI.194.37–44); more mundanely, the face was a proverbially reliable index of character and intent: cf. Ov. *Pont.* 3.4.27 *uultus, certissima pignora mentis* and see Otto 1890: 147 *frons*. *uicistis* ‘you have already won’ is enjambed for maximum effect; the perfect picks up *numquam fallentia* and conveys the certainty of victory: cf. Liv. 21.44.9 (Hannibal at Ticinus) *‘si hoc bene fixum omnibus, <si> destinatum in animo est, iterum dicam, uicistis’* (echoing the beginning of his speech at 21.43.2; Dräger 1874: 233; cf. 285–9n.). Attention is often drawn to the savage or threatening appearance of soldiers’ faces: cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.39–40 *acer et Marsi peditis . . . | uultus in hostem*; Liv. 2.10.8 (Cocles) *circumferens inde truces minaciter oculos ad procures Etruscorum*; note esp. Liv. 7.33.17 *Samnites, cum quaereretur*

*quaenam prima causa tam obstinatos mouisset in fugam, oculos sibi Romanorum ardere uisos aiebant uesanosque uultus et furentia ora* (with Oakley).

**292–4** Caesar's language develops dramatically from that of interpreting *signa* to that of ecstatic prophecy. On these lines see Leigh 1997a: 295–306. Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.21–4, esp. 21 *uidere* [MSS *audire*] *magnum iam uideor duces*, is also a relevant model for Caesar as a 'vision' of a vivid narrative (Pollio's) of this civil war: in the same way Caesar's vision 'anticipates' the poet's account of the battle and points to its ἐνάρξεις (cf. 9–10n.; N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.17).

**292 uideor fluuios spectare cruoris:** inevitably evoking Virgil's Sibyl (A. 6.87: 116n.), but in contrast to Pompey at 116, *fluuios* . . . *cruoris* denotes not the pollution of a specific river but copious blood flowing from the dead and wounded (*OLD fluuius* 1e; for *cruor* of freshly spilt blood (βρότος) see Harrison ad Virg. A. 10.348–9): cf. the full spectacle of massacre withheld from the victorious Moor at 4.785–7 *fluuios non ille cruoris* | . . . *uidet*. A further key contrast to Pompey and the Sibyl is that Caesar reports his vision with enthusiasm rather than horror. Caesar's 'vision' will be realized at 637 *Romanus* . . . *torrens* and 789–90 (Caesar) *cernit propulsa cruore* | *flumina*.

**293 calcatosque simul reges:** *calcare* of an enemy in battle is Ovidian: *Met.* 5.88 (Perseus) *exstructos morientum calcat aceruos* (*reges*: 56n.).

**293–4 sparsumque senatus | corpus:** the common figurative use of *corpus* (*OLD* 15; Sen. *Ep.* 102.6 *corpora esse* . . . *quaedam ex distantibus, quorum adhuc membra separata sunt, tamquam exercitus, populus, senatus*) is literalized by *sparsum*: cf. 10.416–17 *Latium sic scindere corpus* | *dis placitum*.

**294 immensa populos in caede natantes:** the hyperbole of Caesar's vision accords with the epic's emphasis upon the immeasurable (e.g. 1.68 *immensumque aperitur opus*; cf. Masters 1992: 35); the poet had predicted *immensa ruina* for Pompey's forces at 3.290. The image *in caede natantes* develops from Virg. A. 3.625–6 (the Cyclops' cave) *sanieque aspersa natarant* | *limina* and esp. the vision of Thyestes' ghost at Sen. *Ag.* 44 *natabit sanguine alterno domus*, but Lucan's image of nations (114–15n.) 'swimming in slaughter' typically amplifies its models. This 'vision' too (292n.) will be realized at 728–9 *ut Hesperio uidit satis arua natare* | *sanguine*.

**295–6 sed mea fata moror, qui uos in tela furentes | uocibus his teneo:** *uos in tela furentes* 'frantic as you are for battle' (*OLD furo* 4); cf. 2.439 *Caesar in arma furens. teneo* 'I detain'. Caesar's concern not to delay fate is to be distinguished from Pompey's decision to cease doing so (87–8n.). *sed* marks what precedes as digressive (*OLD* 2a) but, despite Caesar's impatience, his transition back to the *paraceleusis* is itself discursive and occupies lines

295–302. In historiography, the general refers to the superfluity of his words in inspiring courage at Thuc. 4.95.1 (Hippocrates at Delium), 6.68.1 (Nicias at Syracuse), Liv. 21.40.1 (Scipio at Ticinus).

**296 bella trahenti** ‘delaying the war’ (*OLD traho* 18); cf. 5.732 *uentura trahentem*. See also 57, 241–2nn.

**297 spe trepido** ‘I tremble with fear’, cf. 386 *spes excitat illos*. At the beginning of his speech Caesar was caught between fear and hope, and suppressed the former (247–8(n.)). For the physical reaction cf. Ov. *Fast.* 3.362 *sollicitae mentes speque metuque pauent*. For hope in pre-battle rhetoric cf. Liv. 21.43.3 (Hannibal) ‘*tanto audacius fortiusque pugnaturi quam hostis, quanto maior spes, maior est animus inferentis vim quam arcentis*’.

**297–8 haud umquam uidi tam magna daturos | tam prope me superos**: Caesar now adopts the language of an epiphany. *tam prope*, i.e. *praesentes*, ‘present to help’ as at Virg. *Ecl.* 1.40–1 *neque . . . licebat | . . . tam praesentis alibi cognoscere diuos* (cf. N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.2; Oakley on Liv. 7.26.7).

**298–9 camporum limite paruo | absumus a uotis** ‘we are removed from our prayers by (only) the small boundary of the plain’ (cf. 113–14); *limite* is ablative of distance (see *OLD absum* 5a). For *limes* of the battlefield cf. V. Fl. 6.361–2 *raptataque limite in arto | membra uiri miseranda meant*.

**299–300 ego sum cui Marte peracto | quae populi regesque tenent donare licebit**: for *donare* of the general’s largesse cf. Liv. 24.30.4 *direptam urbem, bona locupletium donata*. Enriching the troops is naturally a set piece in pre-battle rhetoric: e.g. Liv. 21.43.9, 36.17.13–14 (Acilius to his troops before Thermopylae) ‘*neque ea tantum in praemium uestrum cessura, quae nunc in regiis castris sunt, sed illum quoque omnem apparatus, qui in dies ab Epheso expectatur, praedae futurum*’.

**301–2 quone poli motu, quo caeli sidere uerso | Thessalicae tantum, superi, permittitis orae?** ‘By what movement of the sky, by the changed course of what star of heaven, gods above, do you allow so much to the region of Thessaly?’ The Stoic notion of cosmic sympathy would, in Caesar’s conceit, require the gods to rearrange the stars in order to change an earthly event (Bobzien 1998: 13, 165–6; Jones 2003: 341). The incredulous wonder of Caesar’s apostrophe is marked by the enclitic *-ne*, adding intensity to the interrogative (as at 5.654–5; H–S 461; K–S 11.507.3) and by the variation in anaphora of the initial question; this stresses through delay the surprise location of *Thessalicae*, which is itself emphatic by position and frames line 302 with *orae* (a poetic periphrasis, cf. Catul. 64.280–1 *Thessala . . . ora*).

**303–17** Caesar described the rewards of victory at 264–9 (world-rule) and 299–300 (riches); he now turns to the *poena bellorum*: execution as public enemies at Rome (304–7) or his own suicide (309–10). The consequences of losing are treated frequently in the *paraceuseis* of historiography (see 250–329n.); cf. Sal. *Cat.* 58.9 (Catiline) ‘*si uincimus, omnia nobis tuta erunt . . . si metu cesserimus . . . neque locus neque amicus quisquam teget quem arma non texerint*’ (Narducci 1979: 101). Caesar treats these repercussions vividly and at length: in Virgil success tends to receive more fulsome treatment in similar ‘all or nothing’ (*aut . . . aut . . .*) formulations: e.g. A. 10.862–5 (Mezentius to his horse Rhaebus), 12.14–17 (Turnus in monologue).

**303 *aut merces hodie bellorum aut poena parata***: *bellorum* and *parata* are each taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with *merces* and *poena*.

**304 *Caesareas spectate cruces, spectate catenas***: for Caesar’s urgent repetition of the imperative cf. 1.347 (Caesar to the soldiers) ‘*tollite iam pridem uictricia tollite signa*’ (Wills 1996: 89–95); here alliteration reinforces the effect. *spectate* (‘imagine you are looking at’, *OLD* 1a) marks ἐνάρξεις and evokes the highly visible spectacle of crucifixion. The plural *cruces* is not poetic: *Caesareas* ‘prepared for those on Caesar’s side’. He is not just conjuring up his personal punishment (*pace* Housman), but bidding his army to contemplate their own mass execution. This is hyperbole: crucifixion was reserved for slaves, non-citizens or provincial rebels. It was not applied to citizens or in military contexts (except in cases of desertion; see *OCD* s.v. ‘crucifixion’; Hengel 1977). Caesar most likely invokes it because it was a deterrent to rebels, and the mass crucifixion of a defeated army seems naturally to evoke Spartacus, to whom Pompey had compared Caesar at 2.554. *catenas* (in *hysteron proteron* after *cruces*) suggests the soldiers being led in chains to crucifixion.

**305 *et caput hoc positum rostris***: Caesar is surely thinking of the opponents of Marius and Cinna who were massacred in 87. These included M. Antonius (cos. 99) and his own (distant) kinsmen C. Iulius Caesar Strabo Vopiscus and L. Caesar (cos. 90): cf. Cic. *de Or.* 3.10 *iam M. Antoni in eis ipsis rostris . . . positum caput illud fuit . . . neque uero longe ab eo C. Iuli caput . . . cum L. Iuli fratris capite iacuit*. The events of 87 are selectively recounted at 2.98–129. To Lucan’s readers the head on the rostra must also recall the proscriptions of 43 and especially the fate of Cicero: cf. Liv. *per.* 120 *caput quoque cum dextra manu in rostris positum est*. ***effusaque membra***: *effusa* ‘scattered’ (*TLL* v.2.19.4); in this context Caesar may be thinking of Sulla’s order to exhume and scatter the remains of Gaius Marius into the river Anio in 82 (Cic. *Leg.* 2.22.56).



**306 Saeptorumque nefas et clausi proelia Campi:** both phrases describe the one event ('theme and variation'). In 82, after the Battle of the Colline Gate, Sulla had his opponents executed en masse (*proelia* is deeply ironic). Many sources claim that the *Saepta*, the enclosed voting precinct in the Campus Martius, was the location of the massacre (ASL and *Comm. Bern.* on this line and 2.197; also Lovano 2002: 130 with references at n. 77). Lucan alludes to this event at 2.196–7 *tum flos Hesperiae, Latii iam sola iuuentus, | concidit et miserae maculauit ouilia Romae* (where *ouilia* refers to the *Saepta*; Serv. *ad Virg. Ecl.* 1.33). Caesar's use of the name *Saepta* here is glossed by *clausi* . . . *Campi* and hints at the victims surrounded by their executioners (*OLD saepio* 3).

**307 cum duce Sullano gerimus ciuilia bella:** the epigrammatic summation rounds off 303–7, but Caesar will return to the topic of post-battle punishment at 311–15. *Sullano* is both 'connected with' and 'characteristic of' (for the personal adjective see 146n. on *Martius*). Caesar had developed the theme of Pompey's apprenticeship under Sulla to the soldiers at 1.324–32. For his early career under Sulla see Seager 2002: 25–9.

**308–9 uestri cura mouet, nam me secura manebit | sors quaesita manu:** Caesar must be moved by *cura* for the soldiers because he himself will face death *securus* (a transferred epithet): 'proof' reinforced by alliteration (*cura mouet, nam me secura manebit*) and an ancient (and true) etymological link between *securus* and *cura* (*securus sine cura*; see Maltby 1991: 555). *manu*: the hand is the instrument of suicide (a special use of the word, *OLD manus*<sup>1</sup> 8), cf. 4.577 *seruitium fugisse manu*. *sors* is an example of the common literary trope whereby one's lot or destiny (*OLD sors* 8a) is a euphemism for death (cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.145 μοῖρ . . . θανάτοιο 'fate which consists of death' with Rutherford; *OCD* s.v. 'fate').

**309–10: fodientem uiscera cernit | me mea:** interlacing word order and enjambment increase the impact of the sudden graphic image, an individual enactment of the state suicide promised in the proem: 1.2–3 *populumque potentem | in sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra* (see Hardie 1993: 55; Dinter 2012: 31); cf. also 4.511 (Vulteius) '*cum calido fodiemus uiscera ferro*'.

**310 qui nondum uicto respexerit hoste:** a 'future more vivid' conditional relative clause, thus *qui* stands for *si quis* (A–G §519). *nondum uicto* . . . *hoste* 'when the enemy has not yet been conquered'. Caesar's extreme rhetorical position is that he will kill himself if any soldier so much as looks back, let alone retreats from battle (or sim.).

**311–12 di, quorum curas abduxit ab aethere tellus | Romanusque labor** 'Gods, whose concerns the earth and Roman suffering have



distracted from the heavens': a paradoxical image relying on the Epicurean notion that the gods live in serene detachment from the human race and are not concerned with their affairs (see e.g. Kenney on *Lucr.* 3.18–20). Caesar varies the typical 'hymnic relative', which characterizes the god(s) or denotes their *curae* (Norden 1913: 168–76). *aether* indicates the home of the gods, as at *Virg. A.* 12.853–4 (*Diram demisit ab aethere summo* | *Iuppiter. For Romanusque labor* cf. *Virg. A.* 4.78 *Iliacosque . . . labores*).

**312–15** Caesar prays (*uincat* is optative) that the gods grant victory to the side who will not exact further punishment from their defeated opponents. *Flor. Epit.* 2.13.50–1 records that Caesar urged his troops '*parce ciuibus*' as he pursued Pompey, but adds that this was intended as a boast ((*uox*) *ad iactationem composita*); cf. also *Cic. Marc.* 17 *quos amissimus ciuis, eos uis Martis percudit, non ira uictoriae*, *Suet. Jul.* 75.2; *App. BCiv.* 2.74.309.

**312–13** *uincat quicumque necesse* | *non putat in uictos saeuum destringere ferrum*: cf. Caesar's account of his clemency in Spain at *Civ.* 1.84.5 (Afranius) *orare atque obsecrare . . . ne ad ultimum supplicium progredi necesse habeant*. The adjective *saeuus* is used of weapons associated with savagery or cruelty (*OLD* 2e).

**314–15** *quique suos ciues, quod signa aduersa tulerunt, | non credit fecisse nefas* 'whoever does not believe that his fellow citizens committed a crime (*OLD nefas*) simply because they bore standards opposed to his'. What term to apply to one's opposition to Caesar in the civil war was a fraught issue after his victory, and can be seen vividly explored in Cicero's Caesarian orations; cf. e.g. *Cic. Lig.* 16 (on Ligarius' opposition to Caesar in the war) 'You call his act a crime (*scelus*), do you, Tubero? Why? That is a word that has hitherto not been applied to such a situation. Some use the term "blunder", others "fear", the less charitable speak of hope, ambition, hatred, obstinacy; the sternest judges of recklessness; but of crime none till now save you' (cited by *ASL*). The chiasmic structure *suos ciues . . . signa aduersa* accentuates the contrast of key terms.

**315–17** As an example of unrestrained killing on the part of the victor, Caesar refers to his defeat at Dyrrachium in July 48, when his troops were caught between the ramparts of the Pompeian camp (6.290–305; *Caes. Civ.* 3.69–72; *Plut. Caes.* 39.4–8).

**315–16** *in arto . . . loco*: the confined space of the battle is reported at 6.292 (*obsaeptum . . . in hostem*) and repeatedly stressed in Caesar's account (*Civ.* 3.69.2 *angusto itinere per aggeres*, 3.69.3 *in angustias*, 3.69.4 *angustiis*). For dying in confined spaces in Lucan see 221–2n.

**316 uirtute:** stands for the soldiers themselves, ‘a collectivity of heroic *uiri*’ (Harrison on Virg. A. 10.410 *socium uirtus coit omnis in unum*), as at 3.474–5 *densa testudine muros | tecta subit uirtus*.

**317 quanto satiauit sanguine ferrum:** Caesar claims that almost 1,000 men died (*Civ.* 3.71.1) but adds that a large proportion of these were trampled by their fellow soldiers in panic. *satiauit* ‘satisfied, satiated’ (*OLD* 3), as if the swords themselves were animate (cf. Ov. *Fast.* 5.575 *Mars, ades et satia scelerato sanguine ferrum*). Lucan’s Caesar had previously presented Pompey as possessed of an insatiable, animalistic blood-lust at 1.330–1, but in the poet’s account of Dyrrachium, Pompey restrained the slaughter: 6.300–1 *ipse furentes | dux tenuit gladios*.

**318–19 uos tamen hoc oro, iuuenes, ne caedere quisquam | hostis terga uelit: ciuis qui fugerit esto:** his summative statement of Caesar’s clemency, reflecting the terms of his prayer at 311–15, will be overshadowed by the grotesque indifference to *pietas* encouraged at 320–5. *iuuenes* is a frequent term of address for soldiers (Virg. A. 2.348, Liv. 3.61.7). *ne . . . uelit*: prohibitions regularly substitute present for perfect subjunctive in poetry (A–G §540 n. 3). *ciuis qui fugerit esto*: cf. Enn. *Ann.* 234–5 Skutsch (Hannibal) ‘*hostem qui feriet, † erit*’, inquit, ‘*mi † Carthaginiensis | quisquis erit*’. By defining only those who do not oppose him as *ciues*, Caesar sidesteps the *nefas* of killing fellow citizens. The phrase recalls earlier Caesarian definitions of citizenship at 1.279 (Curio) ‘*tua nos faciet uictoria ciues*’ and 1.373–4 (Laelius) ‘*nec ciuis meus est, in quem tua classica, Caesar, | audiero*’. The archaic third person imperative *esto* is ironically solemn in this cowardly formula of citizenship (*NLS* §127n.).

**320 dum tela micant:** the verb describes light glittering from moving weapons (*OLD* *mico* 3b).

**320–2 non uos pietatis imago | ulla nec aduersa conspecti fronte parentes | commoueant:** cf. Florus 2.13.50 (Caesar) *uoces quoque obequantis acceptae, altera cruenta, sed docta et ad uictoriam efficax ‘miles faciem feri!’*. These lines further recall the oath of the centurion Laelius at 1.376–7. While it is true that Caesar thus shares his troops’ mentality (Leigh 1997a: 210), this is a frame of mind also found in the Pompeians at 181–3. Caesar seeks to forestall his soldiers’ emotional response to visual stimulus; the combination *imago* and *commouere* ‘to affect emotionally’ (*OLD* 10) gives a Lucretian ring to these lines (cf. Lucr. 4.235–6 on *imagines* causing vision, 4.746–7 on mental pictures). *aduersa conspecti fronte* could mean ‘seen in the opposing line’ (*OLD frons*<sup>a</sup> 6, cf. Braund), or more pointedly ‘seen facing you, head on’ (*OLD frons*<sup>a</sup> 1e; cf. 575 *aduersosque iubet ferro confundere uultus*): wounds received *aduerso pectore* rather than on the back were in normal circumstances a good thing. *non* is used instead of *ne* in Caesar’s

command because it negates only *ulla* (cf. Tib. 2.1.9–10 *non audeat ulla lanificam pensis imposuisse manum*). *pietatis imago* calls to mind the fundamental virtue of the *Aeneid* as it applies to the duty owed by children to parents (closest is 6.405 (the Sibyl to Charon) ‘*si te nulla mouet tantae pietatis imago*’; cf. 9.294, 10.824). The perversion or suppression of *pietas* is a prominent theme in the poem; it is perhaps best exemplified in the oath of Laelius to Caesar at 1.374–86; see Ahl 1976: 275–9; Coffee 2011.

**322 uultus gladio turbate uerendos** ‘disfigure with your sword the faces which command your awe’. Caesar’s brutal logic is to remove the *pietatis imago* by destroying the father’s physical features; the logic is applied at 626–30. The order (repeated at 575) recalls the Sullan mutilation of Marius Gratidianus (cf. 2.190–1 ‘*quid perdere fructum | uiuit et, ut uilem, Marii confundere uultum?*’), which was also cast as a *scelus* pleasing to the commander (2.192, cf. 7.325 *scelus imputet*). The father was normatively *uerendus*; cf. Cic. *Planc.* 29 (Plancius) *uiuat . . . cum parente . . . quem ueretur ut deum*. At 8.679–80 the hair on Pompey’s decapitated head is described as *illa uerenda | regibus hirta coma*.

**323–5** ‘Whether anyone attacks [*OLD eo* 7a] a relative’s breast with hostile sword, or violates with a wound no bond of loyalty, let him still claim credit for [*OLD imputo* 3a] the slaughter of an unknown enemy as if it were a crime’: a formula which effectively marks out everyone for death (Hardie 1993: 55). In this conditional sentence (future more vivid: A–G §514) *siue* and *seu* introduce two disjunctive protases (‘whether . . . or’, *OLD* 4) leading to a common apodosis. Note that *tamquam scelus* is appropriate only for *nullum uiolarit . . . pignus*: the apodosis must be modified to fit *cognata in pectora ferro | ibit*. For this kind of ellipsis Housman *ad loc.* compares Hor. *S.* 2.2.11–3 *seu pila uelox | molliter austerum studio fallente laborem, | seu te discus agit, pete cedentem aera disco*, where *hude pila* must be supplied with *seu pila* [i.e. *agit*].

**324 seu nullum uiolarit uulnere pignus**: cf. Virg. *A.* 11.591 (Diana, about Camilla) ‘*quicumque sacrum uiolarit uulnere corpus*’.

**325 ignoti iugulum tamquam scelus inputet hostis**: *ignoti* and *hostis*, the key terms of contrast with 323 *cognata in pectora* and 324 *pignus*, frame the line. *iugulum* as a metonym for *caedes* is first found in Lucan (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.638.53–7).

**326–8** Cf. App. *BCiv.* 2.74.310 (Caesar) ‘Before all else, in order that I may know that you are mindful of your promise to choose victory or death, throw down the walls of your camp as you go out to battle and fill up the ditch, so that we may have no place of refuge if we do not conquer, and so that the enemy may see that we have no camp and know that

we are compelled to encamp in theirs' (trans. White). For the general's order to destroy one's own camp in order to inspire his army (or withhold the possibility of their retreat) cf. Liv. 9.23.13 (with Oakley's note); Curt. 4.13.26 (Alexander at Guagamela) *proruto uallo exire copias iubet aciemque disponit*. In the thematic economy of *BC* this strategy also symbolizes the suicidal quality of Caesar's actions: cf. 1.155 (Caesar as lightning) *in sua templa furit* (echoing 1.3 *in sua uiscera*) and 1.212 (Caesar as lion) *per ferrum tanti securus uulneris exit* (Masters 1992: 2 n. 5, 29; Leigh 1997a: 217–18).

**326 sternite iam uallum fossasque implete ruina:** for the regular language of filling ditches and destroying military ramparts see Oakley on Liv. 9.14.9. *sternite* varies the usual prose verbs *proruere* or *(re)scindere*. The ablative *ruina*, unnecessary for sense, may hint at something of a larger scale than a palisade: cf. Lucr. 6.599–600 (an earthquake) *hiatum* | ... *suis* ... *uelit complere ruinis*.

**327 exeat ut plenis acies non sparsa manipulis:** *non sparsa* 'not straggling' (*OLD* *sparsus* 1b), cf. 10.436–8 (Achillas' army) *acies non sparsa manipulis* | *nec uaga conspicitur sed iustos qualis ad hostes* | *recta fronte uenit*.

**328 parcite ne castris:** *ne* + imp. in prohibitions is early, colloquial or poetic (cf. *OLD* *ne*<sup>1</sup> 1).

**328–9 uallo tendetis in illo | unde acies peritura uenit:** *tendetis* 'you will pitch your tents' (*OLD* 3b) is military usage (e.g. Caes. *Gal.* 6.37.2) incorporated into epic by Virgil (*A.* 2.29 *hic saeuus tendebat Achilles*). *illo* indicates a gesture by Caesar to the enemy camp, while his closing phrase *unde acies peritura uenit* recalls 237, when he first saw the Pompeians marching out into the plain, and suggests that this process has been ongoing since that moment.

### 329–36 CAESAR'S FORCES REACT TO HIS SPEECH

**329–30 uix cuncta locuto | Caesare:** ablative absolute. This is an unusual version of the more common epic formula *uix ea fatus erat* (× 6 in Virg. *A.*; × 1 in Ov. *Met.*); *cuncta* may look to the length of Caesar's speech.

**330 quemque suum munus trahit** describes military discipline, in contrast to the power of personal desire at Virg. *Ecl.* 2.65 *trahit sua quemque uoluptas* (see also Lucr. 2.258 *quo ducit quemque uoluptas*).

**330–1 armaque raptim | sumpta Ceresque uiris** 'arms are hurriedly taken up and food eaten by the men' *uiris*: dative of agent (G–L 354); both *arma* and *Ceres* ('food in general', by metonymy) are subjects of *sumpta*

with different meanings of the verb in each case ('syllepsis', *OLD* *rumo* 1b, 3a). Both arming and eating are type scenes in epic which are typically described in greater detail. For *raptim* cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.85.4 *confestimque expeditas copias educit*. Food before battle reflects Roman military practice (Veg. *Mil.* 3.11) and the earlier epic tradition (as at Hom. *Il.* 19.155–70).

**331 capiunt praesagia belli** 'they accept the omens of the war', with *capiunt* simple for the compound *accipiunt* (in the sense given by *OLD* *accipio* 16). The soldiers take Caesar's prediction at 328–9 to have the force of prophecy, and so they execute his command to destroy their camp.

**332 calcatisque ruunt castris:** *ruere* often describes rushing into battle (Virg. *A.* 7.782 *in bella ruebat*; Liv. 7.14.10 *in proelium ruunt*). In *BC* *calcare* is more commonly used of trampling over dead bodies (as at 293, 529, 620).

**332–3 stant ordine nullo, | arte ducis nulla, permittuntque omnia fatis:** the contrast with Pompey's carefully ordered lines at 216–17(n.) echoes Homer's contrast of disorderly Trojans and disciplined Greeks at *Il.* 3.1–9 (Lausberg 1985: 1568–72). In Caesar's prose, the ablative of manner *ordine nullo* describes ill-disciplined opponents of Caesar on the march (*Gal.* 2.11.1, *Civ.* 2.26.4). In Lucan, Caesar and his troops often share the same mindset (320–2n.): cf. 5.301–3 *fata sed in praeceps solitus demittere Caesar | fortunamque suam per summa pericula gaudens | exercere uenit*. The army's commitment to fate may variously call to mind the equanimity of the Stoic *sapiens* (Sen. *Dial.* 1.5.8 *Quid est boni uiri? praebere se fato*) or the destructive potential of Hannibal (Val. Max. 1.7 ext. 1 (spoken to Hannibal in a dream) *Italiae uides' inquit 'uastitatem: proinde sile et cetera tacitis permittite fatis'*).

**334–6** 'If one had placed in that fatal battle as many fathers-in-law of Magnus and as many men seeking tyranny over their own city, they would not rush into battle in so headlong a charge': a mixed conditional in past time. *locasses*, Grotius' emendation of **ΩC** *locasset*, is an extension of the generalizing second person subjunctive, which is more typically potential in nature and applied to verbs of seeing, believing or thinking (A–G §§517, 518). Mayer 1979: 348 argues for retaining *locasset* with Caesar understood as the subject. To mitigate the resulting tautology ('if Caesar had placed so many Caesars') he takes *Magni soceros* as generalizing ('men like Caesar'), which dilutes too much the vivid image of an army of Caesars. Lines 235–336, treating Caesar's reaction, his speech and its effect, close with this paradox assimilating totally the zeal for battle felt by Caesar's soldiers with that of their general. It is characteristic of Caesar's troops to move *praecipiti cursu*: cf. their invasion of Brundisium at 2.706, their rush to war at 3.390–1 (styled *belli | praecipitem cursum*) or their charge against

close-packed formations at 496; at 2.656 Caesar is *in omnia praeceps*, at 10.507–8 he is *semper feliciter usus* | *praecipiti cursu bellorum*.

### 337–384 POMPEY EXHORTS HIS SOLDIERS

This is Pompey's second speech to the soldiers in book 7, his third and final oration to his army in the poem (85–127n.). In contrast to 85–127, a capitulation to his army's demands for battle, this is a pre-battle exhortation (the term is *paraceleusis* in Gk. or *ad-/exhortatio* in Latin, see further 250–329n.). As such it uses a number of rhetorical elements found in exhortations in historiography: battle as an end to the army's labour (343–4); the appeal to wives, children and national gods (346–8, 369–76); the notion that the gods put the rewards of battle on the plain (348), or favour the morally superior side (349–55); the army's responsibility to live up to the achievements of their ancestors (356–60); the enemy as sacrificial victim (350–1).

Pompey's speech should be compared to Caesar's at 250–329, by which it is surpassed in length (77½ as opposed to 40 lines), optimism and verve. Caesar's rhetorical dominance of Pompey foreshadows the latter's defeat and mirrors the characterization of both men in the poem. Their speeches correspond on the topics of the 'hoped-for day' (342–4n.; cf. 250–60); the size and ethnicity of Pompey's army (355–68; cf. 274–5); in their varying use of ἐνάργεια (369–76; cf. 292–4, 304–6); and in attributing responsibility for their own personal fate to their armies (379; cf. 253). In contrast to his speech at 85–127, there is minimal common ground here with his pre-battle speech at Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.2–5 (see 85–127n.); one momentary exception is his words on tactics and superior numbers at 365–8: subjects suppressed in his earlier speech.

*Structure.* Pompey proceeds through four main sections: (i) an opening appeal to fight well because the critical hour has arrived (342–6) and in order to return to country, home and family (346–8); (ii) the gods support his better cause (349–55); (iii) his army: their republican quality (355–60) and superior numbers (360–8); (iv) a peroration evoking family and Rome as well as present and future generations (369–76), followed by a personal appeal (376–82).

Pompey's speech is begun in fear (339–41) and strives to arouse pity (369–76); it ends in bathos (380–2) and sadness (382–3); 'he seems to be saying all the wrong things' (Ahl 1976: 165). Even so, his arousal of these emotions has a galvanizing effect on his army and elicits from them the immediate, passionate response they have twice denied him in the poem. Theirs is a paradoxically fervent response, born of his frank expression of a fear that the Romans within his army share, viz. the prospect of enduring servitude to Caesar; it may point to a deepening emotional connection on

their part to Pompey as he nears his catastrophic reversal of fortunes. On Pompey's speech see further Ahl 1976: 164–7; Goebel 1981; Narducci 2002: 309–12; Rolim de Moura 2010: 82–5.

**337–8 uidit ut hostiles in rectum exire cateruas | Pompeius: in rectum** 'straight forward' (*OLD* *rectus* 2d). *uidit* in first place cues the reader to Pompey's subjective view, reflected in *hostiles*. *cateruas*, which can be a neutral term (367 Pompey on his own forces) or pejorative when in contrast to *legio* or *cohors* (*TLL* III.609.65–610.40), may describe the Caesarian forces who take to the field *ordine nullo* (332).

**338–9 nullasque moras permittere bello | sed superis placuisse diem:** with *nullasque moras permittere* (the second infinitive phrase with *cateruas*) and the new clause *placuisse diem* the meaning of *uidit* shifts from 'saw' to 'perceived' (*OLD* 14b). Pompey was clearly still hoping to postpone the encounter, despite his earlier claim to forswear delay (88). *superis placuisse diem* ominously recalls 1.128 *uictrix causa deis placuit*. At 1.13–14 Pompey had already attributed to the gods the fact that the decisive encounter had come. The present lines may point up the difference between his rhetoric then and his realization now.

**339–41** At 2.45–9 Caesar had experienced a similar moment of hesitation and dread. Pompey now experiences shock and fear; his troops had felt the same emotions on his behalf at 1.33–4 when they realized that the day of battle had arrived. At 2.11–14 the narrator had predicted that readers of the poem would feel this way for Pompey (cf. 297n.). It may point to Pompey's self-centredness that his fear is not described as arising out of concern for someone or something else. For a more detailed and emotionally complex description of the doomed hero at a critical moment of realization cf. Turnus at Virg. *A.* 12.665–8.

**339–40 stat corde gelato | attonitus:** *corde gelato* indicates fear (cf. Andr. *poet.* frag. 16(17) (Ulysses) *cor frigit prae pauore*; Virg. *A.* 10.452 *frigidus Arcadibus coit in praecordia sanguis*; Juv. 6.95–6 *timent pavidoque gelantur | pectore*). At this crucial moment the theme of Pompey's inertia and Caesar's dynamism recurs: *stat* contrasts with the onrushing movement of the Caesarians (332 *ruunt*, 336) and may recall 1.135 *stat magni nominis umbra*; on the other hand *attonitus* (cf. *OLD* 1) reminds the reader that Caesar is like a thunderbolt and suggests a similar speed for his troops. For the phrase cf. 3.713–14 (Tyrrhenus) *stat lumine raptō | attonitus*.

**340–1 tantoque duci sic arma timere | omen erat:** *tantoque duci* 'for so great a general' acts as a gloss on the name Magnus; the sentence restates the reversed *nomen/omen* figure haunting Pompey throughout the poem (Feeney 1986b: 239). The predicate *omen erat* is given prominence by



enjambment and by the strong sense pause at the second foot caesura (as at 340 *attonitus*).

**341 premit inde metus:** cf. Virg. A. 1.208–9 (248n.). Lucan has transposed the hero's suppression of negative emotions from the end of the speech to its beginning.

**341–2 totumque per agmen | sublimi praeuectus equo:** for the general's exhortation while riding along the front ranks see Liv. 6.7.3 with Kraus; it may hint here at the scale of Pompey's army. *sublimis* 'imposingly tall', of animals (*OLD* 6a): his lofty position contrasts with his wish at 379 to grovel at the feet of his soldiers. The next time he is explicitly on horseback (677–8) is the beginning of his flight from battle.

**342–4** These sentiments correspond to Caesar's opening at 250–60 (cf. 251n.). Pompey differs from Caesar most notably in his strong intimation that he does not want battle (stated plainly at 91–2(n.)): with *uestra* in emphatic position contrast Caesar at 250 *rerum fortuna mearum*, 254 *mihi*; with the second person plural *quaesistis* contrast Caesar's first person plurals at 255, 256. Pompey also contrasts with Caesar in his use of the topos that battle will bring an end to the army's labour (Goebel 1981: 83 n. 13 compares Liv. 21.43.10 (Hannibal) '*hic uobis terminum laborum fortuna dedit*').

**342–3 quem flagitat . . . | 'uestra diem uirtus** puts a positive spin on the mutiny at 45–61. *dies* (antecedent of *quem* and subject of *adest*) is incorporated into the relative clause.

**343–4 finis ciuilibus armis, | quem quaesistis, adest:** cf. Virg. A. 12.793 (Jupiter) '*quae iam finis erit, coniunx?*' Caesar's troops had asked him at 5.273 '*finis quis quaeritur armis?*' After book 7, the question of the end of the war will re-emerge with increased urgency: 9.232–3 (the Pompeians to Cato) '*nam quis erit finis si nec Pharsalia pugnae | nec Pompeius erit?*' For the arrival of the much anticipated day cf. Caesar at 251.

**344 totas effundite uires** 'expend all of your strength' (*OLD* *effundo* 11b); cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.278 (Jupiter) '*uires effundite uestras*' and Liv. 10.28.6 (Decius) *quantumcumque uirium habuit certamine primo effudit*.

**345 extremum ferri superest opus:** cf. e.g. Liv. 22.55.2 (fear regarding Hannibal after Cannae) *hostem ad oppugnandam Romam, quod unum opus belli restaret, uenturum*. The more common periphrasis *opus/labor belli* (as at 93; cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.208 φυλόπιδος μέγα ἔργον 'the great work of war') is here sharpened by the substitution *ferri*.

**345–6 unaque gentes | hora trahit** 'and one hour draws together the nations of the world' (*OLD* *gens* 2a, *traho* 6b). *trahit* also suggests 'drags



down into ruin' (*OLD* 8b; Braund's translation): a nuance better understood as an ironic subtext, since Pompey's present tone is different from the end of his last speech (cf. 112–23) and the notion of defeat undermines the motivational intent of the sentence. For *una hora* cf. e.g. Liv. 1.29.6 (on Alba); Cic. *Sulla* 73; Curt. 5.2.12; and cf. the 'one day' topos in Greek tragedy.

**346–8** Thucydides (7.69.2) notes that the appeal to wives, children and national gods was to be expected in pre-battle exhortations.

**346** *patriam carosque penates*: cf. Lucr. 3.85–6 *saepe homines patriam carosque parentis | prodiderunt*. The pairing of *patria* and *penates* in emotionally charged contexts is common in prose and verse.

**347** *subolem ac thalamos desertaque pignora* 'children and marriages, the ties he has left behind' (*-que* is explanatory: *OLD* 6); cf. Virg. A. 10.280–1 (Turnus, exhorting his soldiers) '*nunc coniugis esto | quisque suae tectique memor*'. Lucan favours *suboles* (× 6 in *BC*; once each in Virg. A. and Ov. *Met.*), an archaism for Cicero (*de Orat.* 3.153).

**348** *ense petat*: cf. 252 (Caesar) '*iam fatum accersite ferro*'. **medio posuit deus omnia campo**: cf. Virg. A. 12.80 (Turnus) '*illo quaeratur coniunx Launina campo*'; Sen. *Thy.* 203–4 *in medio est scelus | positum occupanti* (with Tarrant). Behind Pompey's *sententia* lies the rhetorical notion that the gods place the prizes of battle on the plain and adjudicate their award: cf. e.g. Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.21 'For all of these good things (ταῦτα τὰ ἀγαθὰ) now have been placed (κεῖται) in the middle (ἐν μέσῳ) as prizes for whichever of us prove braver men; and the judges of the contest are the gods, who, in all likelihood, will be on our side.'

**349–55** Pompey appeals to a theodicy which does not exist in the poem. These lines may be compared with Caesar's statements on the gods in his oration: at 297–8 he has never seen them so near or so obliging; at 301–2 he asks them why they have entrusted so much to Thessaly; and cf. esp. 311–15, where Caesar lays claim to being the better cause because of the clemency he will show the defeated.

**349** *causa iubet melior superos sperare secundos*: Pompey ('deluded as normal', Feeney 1991: 279 n. 128) urges faith in favouring gods in a grand triple alliteration, despite sensing their treachery at 85–6(n.). At 647–8 he will recognize their abandonment of him. Pompey elsewhere claims that his is the better cause (2.530 '*melioraque signa secuti*'), but the narrator had undermined the reasoning (also held by Cicero at 76–7 and Cornelia at 8.93–4 '*cunctosque fugavi | a causa meliore deos*') that this moral superiority would ensure divine favour at 1.128 *uictrix causa deis placuit*.

At 4.259 the narrator told Caesar that, after the massacre of fraternizing soldiers at Ilerda, he will be the *dux causae melioris*.

**350 ipsi tela regent per uiscera Caesaris:** gods may direct the weapons of their favourites (Virg. *A.* 9.409 with Hardie). Anaphora of *ipsi* in first and last metrical position marks Pompey's heightened emotions, while diaereses after the third, fourth and fifth feet emphasize the graphic *uis-cera Caesaris*.

**350–1 ipsi | Romanas sancire uolunt hoc sanguine leges:** *sancire* 'to ratify solemnly' (*OLD* 1a); this would normally involve the ritual sacrifice of an animal victim (Wissowa 1912: 550–4; Hickson-Hahn 1999). Pompey's point is that Caesar will play the role of this sacrificial victim; for this conceit cf. Cic. *Red. Pop.* 13 *cum omnia . . . foedera . . . sanguine meo sancirentur* and Liv. 23.8.11 (Calavius) '*sanguine Hannibalis sanciam Romanum foedus*'. For the language of sacrifice and substitution in Lucan see Hardie 1993: 53–6. Etymology reinforces Pompey's rhetoric (Serv. on *A.* 12.200 '*sancire*' . . . *sanctum aliquid . . . facere fuso sanguine hostiae: et dictum 'sanctum', quasi sanguine consecratum*, see Maltby 1991: 542). This edition prints **MU** *uolunt* for **Ω** *uolent*: the gods' present wish explains their future assistance.

**352–3 si socero dare regna meo mundumque pararent, | praecipitare meam fatis potuere senectam:** *regna . . . mundumque* 'dominion over the world' (hendiadys). The indicative mood of *potuere* is literal (and not the contrary to fact apodosis, cf. 204n. *potuit*): 'if they were preparing, they were able'; the actual apodosis, *et hoc fecissent* (or sim.) is suppressed. *praecipitare* 'hurry to an end' with *fatis* as ablative of means (not dative, *pace* Hudson-Williams 1954: 188). *fatum* regularly (though not exclusively) describes natural causes of death (*TLL* vi.359.22) such as sickness, to which Pompey refers here. He was gravely ill in the summer of 50; Italy united in prayers for his health and in rejoicing at his recovery (Cic. *Att.* 8.16.1, 9.5.3; Vell. 2.28.2; Plut. *Pomp.* 57.9). After Pharsalus, the tradition grew that it would have been better for him to have died in 50 (e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.86; Juv. 10.283–4): on this theme in *BC* see Leigh 1997a: 118–25. For Pompey's old age in the poem see 1.129–30; he will end this speech at 382 by describing himself as a *senex*.

**354–5 non iratorum populis urbiue deorum est | Pompeium seruare ducem:** *iratorum . . . deorum* is genitive of characteristic. Others, such as Arruns (1.617) and the narrator (2.1 *iamque irae patuere deum*), recognize the war as resulting from the *ira deorum*, but Pompey's view is naturally influenced by self-interest: from his perspective a Pompeian victory would disprove the *ira deorum*. In the poem's theodicy, preservation by the gods does not necessarily equate to divine favour: cf. 2.85–6 (on Marius) *hunc*,

*Cimbri, seruate senem. non ille fauore | numinis, ingenti superum protectus ab ira.*  
On Pompey's third-person self-reference see 112n.

**355–6 quae uincere possint | omnia contulimus:** relative clause of characteristic. With this broad statement, Pompey moves on to the topic of the quality and quantity of his soldiers. This edition prints **ZM** *possint* for **Ω** *possent* (written over another word in U). The aspect of *contulimus* is better understood as present completed ('we have assembled') than past simple ('we assembled').

**356–7 subiere pericula clari | sponte uiri sacraque antiquus imagine miles** 'illustrious men have taken on [*OLD* *subeo* 7b] danger voluntarily and our army resembles those of old in its divine appearance'; this translation conveys Housman's interpretation of *sacraque antiquus imagine miles*, in which *imagine* is used of memories or imaginings (*TLL* vii<sup>1</sup>.409.23). Stephen Oakley tentatively suggests that it may rather mean 'famous men and soldiers that recall older times because of their venerable *imagines* have volunteered spontaneously for danger'; here *imagine* (singular for plural) refers to the wax masks of their ancestors. In this latter interpretation the army seems *antiquus* because it is filled with men who descended from republican heroes: a notion which leads naturally to Pompey's next point at 358–9, that if there were still Curii, Camilli and Decii, they would be in this army. On either interpretation this very compressed sentence implicitly explains the preceding statement: the Pompeians have all that they require for victory because their army (*miles* is a collective singular) is one such as was characteristic of the middle republic, in which senators and *nobiles* served in the rank and file (Housman). *clarus* points to senatorial rank (*OLD* 7b); *antiquus* denotes virtues associated with a period long ago (*OLD* g).

**358–9 si Curios his fata darent reducesque Camillos | temporibus Deciosque caput fatale uouentes:** Pompey bolsters his generalizing claim upon old republican values by making his side the choice of redoubtable historical *exempla* who recognize their own virtues reflected in his army. The same three men were the first of the *felices umbrae* seen in the underworld by the corpse at 6.785–7 '*uidi Decios natumque patremque, | lustrales bellis animas, flentemque Camillum | et Curios*': for both passages in *BC* cf. Virg. *G.* 2.179 (the flower of Italy) *Decios Marios magnosque Camillos* and *A.* 6.824–5 (Anchises to Aeneas) '*quin Decios Drusosque procul saeuumque secure | aspice Torquatam et referentem signa Camillum*'. Hyperbaton of *his* and enjambed *temporibus* make vivid the notion of these figures of the remote past serving in the contemporary conflict. In such exemplary catalogues generalizing plurals ('men such as') are common.

**358 Curios:** M'. Curius Dentatus ended the Third Samnite War and conquered the Sabines in 290. He later defeated the Senones (283), Pyrrhus (275) and the Lucani (274). He was regarded as a model of frugality and incorruptibility; most relevant here is his status as defender of Rome against Pyrrhus. **reducesque Camillos:** M. Furius Camillus conquered Veii (396); he was supposedly sent into exile in 391, from which he returned to defeat the Gauls who had sacked Rome (390). *reduces* 'restored (to life)' (*OLD* 2c), Lucan's equivalent to Virg. *A.* 6.825 *referentem signa* (full quote at 358–9n.); it is to be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with *Curios* and the dative *his temporibus* (doubling as indirect object of *darent*). With *Camillos reduces* may further suggest 'returning from exile' (*OLD* 2a; cf. *Stat. Silv.* 5.2.53), pointing to the moment of Camillus' rescue of Rome from the Gauls.

**359 Deciosque caput fatale uouentes** 'and the Decii, vowing their lives as instruments of fate' (*OLD caput* 4b, *fatalis* 4a). P. Decius Mus died in battle against the Latini at the Vesperis in 340 by performing *deuotio*, a ritual suicide committed by charging on horseback into the front ranks of the enemy army (cf. *Liv.* 8.8.19–11.1 with Oakley 1998: 477–86). This act was believed to consecrate both the Roman general and the enemy army to the gods of the underworld (*OCD* s.v. '*devotio*'). His eponymous son died by the same ritual against the Celts at Sentinum in 295 (see Oakley 2007: 290–1 on *Liv.* 10.24.1–31.7). His grandson was defeated in a battle against Pyrrhus in 279; there later developed an unfounded tradition that he too died by this ritual (*Cic. Fin.* 2.61, *Tusc.* 1.89).

**360 hinc starent** 'they would stand on this side' (*OLD hinc* 6a, *sto* 12a); their choice is emphatically enjambed at the end of the sentence. In Lucan the regular idiomatic phrase *hinc stare* 'be on my side' (2.565–6 with Fantham) is used more literally, as at *Hor. Carm.* 3.4.58–9 *hinc audius stetit* | *Volcanus*.

**360–2 primo gentes oriente coactae | innumeraeque urbes . . . | exciuer**  
**manus:** *coactae*, 'recruited' (*OLD* 3a), may suggest 'subjugated' (*OLD* 1o), since these are the nations and cities conquered in Pompey's eastern campaign. *exciuer* 'summoned' (*OLD* 2a).

**361 quantas in proelia numquam** 'in such numbers as they have never before summoned for battle'; the verb *exciuer* is supplied from the main clause.

**362 toto simul utimur orbe:** cf. 2.642–4 (Pompey) '*totos mea, nate, per ortus | bella feres totoque urbes agitabis in orbe | perdomitas*'. At 53–4 Pompey was accused of indulging in tyranny over the world (cf. 52–5n. for further context).

**363–4 quidquid signiferi comprehensum limite caeli | sub Noton et Borean hominum sumus, arma mouemus** ‘all we men who are enclosed within the bound of the zodiac, as far as the south and north wind, are wielding weapons’ (*Noton* and *Borean* are Greek accusatives). Pompey means the population of the inhabitable northern temperate zone, over which runs the zodiac (e.g. Virg. *G.* 1.238–9; Housman p. 329; *OCCL* s.v. ‘astronomy’). His hyperbole is dignified by this scientific periphrasis and the hyperbaton of *quidquid* and *hominum* (partitive genitive). The conclusion *arma mouemus* is emphasized through its position after the bucolic diaeresis.

**365–6 nonne superfusus collectum cornibus hostem | in medium dabimus?** ‘Shall we not surround the dense-packed enemy by pouring round our wings?’ (Braund; cf. *OLD* do 19b). This is the first indication that Pompey has a strategy for the battle; cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.3 (Pompey) ‘*persuasi equitibus nostris . . . ut cum propius sit accessum, dextrum Caesaris cornu ab latere aperto aggredierentur et circumuenta a tergo acie . . . perturbatum exercitum pellerent*’. In Lucan the strategy is cast as a natural development of thought from his numerical superiority; note the contrast of *superfusus* (‘overflowing’, *OLD* 2b) with *collectum*.

**366–8 paucas uictoria dextras | exigit, at plures tantum clamore cateruae | bella gerent:** *exigit* ‘demands’ (*OLD* 9a). Pompey responds with sheer numbers to Caesar’s imputation that his army is foreign (274–5n.). The notion that most will wage war with only shouting pushes to the point of paradox the optimism of Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.3–4 (partially quoted at 92–4n.), where Pompey promises that the enemy will be routed by his cavalry before a weapon has been cast, in a war without danger to the legions and almost without wounds.

**368 Caesar nostris non sufficit armis:** i.e. Caesar does not have sufficient forces to engage with all of ours. Heavy syllables stress Pompey’s terminal *sententia*; the verb had memorably expressed Caesar’s limitless ambition at 3.50–1 *neque enim iam sufficit ulla | praecipiti fortuna uiro*; cf. also 5.356 (Caesar of his troops) ‘*quibus hic non sufficit orbis*’.

**369–76** Pompey reprises and amplifies the appeal to family from 346–8. He bids the soldiers imagine that they are before the walls of Rome, under the gaze of their mothers, the senate, personified *Roma* and all present and future generations; cf. 292–4, where Caesar ‘seems to see’ torrents of blood and their enemies trampled down, and 304–6, where he urges his troops to imagine their own capital punishment. Whereas Caesar’s ἐνάργεια aimed to evoke either confidence in victory or fear, Pompey strives to arouse pity, a goal he maintains for the rest of the speech and one hallmark of the peroration in rhetorical treatises (cf. *Rhet. Her.*

2.47; Quint. 6.1.23–7; *Comm. Bern. ad loc.* treat this as the beginning of Pompey's oration). Pompey's image is assisted by the conceit that Rome is wherever the senate is (as at 5.17–30; cf. also Pompey's personalized version at 8.132–3 '*hic sacra domus carique penates, | hic mihi Roma fuit*'). Soldiers on the plain imagining an audience of women and elders on the city walls evokes the *teichoscopia* (cf. Hom. *Il.* 3.146–244), an epic set piece whose rich emotional potential Pompey is clearly trying to exploit; it may also hint uncomfortably at the Virgilian motif of death *ante ora parentum* (on which see O'Sullivan 2009). At the same time the desperate position of non-combatants on the wall of a besieged city was also a tragic historical topos: cf. Caes. *Gal.* 2.13.3 *pueri mulieresque ex muro passis manibus suo more pacem ab Romanis petiuerunt*; Virg. *A.* 11.877–8, 11.887–8, 11.891–5 (further references at Leigh 1997a: 251 n. 53).

**369–70 credite pendentes e summis moenibus urbis | crinibus effusis hortari in proelia matres:** consecutive lines in a repeating metrical pattern (DSSS) and the same alliteration at the beginning of each line; the emotive word *matres* is delayed until last place, as with 371 *senatum*, 373 *Romam*. *pendentes e summis moenibus urbis* 'leaning forward from Rome's highest city-walls' (*OLD* *pendeo* 7a, *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.1034.5; *OLD* *urbs* 2). For *crinibus effusis* see 38–9n.

**371–2 credite grandaeuum uetitumque aetate senatum | arma sequi:** the Roman senate is emotively recast as Homeric δηρογέροντες 'elders of the people': cf. *Il.* 3.150 γήραϊ δὴ πολέμοιο πεπαυμένοι 'having ceased from battle because of old age'; Lucan's version, *uetitumque aetate . . . arma sequi*, personifies old age and suggests a formal prohibition against taking part in the battle; cf. Virg. *A.* 8.508–9 (Evander) '*saecisque effeta senectus | inuidet imperium*'. The image is enhanced by chiasmic assonance: -a-, -ae-, -um . . . -um-, ae-, -a- (partially echoed in *senatum* | *arma*).

**372 sacros pedibus prosternere canos** 'are laying their sacred white locks at your feet'. This elaborate gesture of submission (*OLD* *prosterno* 3b) reflects an impassioned imprecation to fight well on their behalf (as at 370 *hortari in proelia*), but it seems also to suggest the Pompeians themselves as conquering city-besiegers.

**373 atque ipsam domini metuentem occurrere Romam:** cf. Sil. 4.408–9 (Scipio) '*ipsam turrigero portantem uertice muros | credite summissas Romam nunc tendere palmas*'. *metuens* usually has its object in the genitive (*OLD* *metuens* 1; cf. K–S 1.450–1); for *Roma*'s fear of Caesar cf. 1.186 *patriae trepidantis imago*. Caesar is often styled a *dominus* in the poem, although the term is not used of him exclusively (e.g. 1.85 *tribus dominis communis, Roma*); his rule, and that of the early Caesars, is presented as enslavement for the Romans (e.g. 444–5). The introduction with *atque ipsam* (Solodow 1972:

304) and the threefold gradation in intensity (family – senate – personified city) suggest the climactic member of a tricolon; hyperbaton with *Romam* gives it further weight. For personified Rome in *BC* see Dinter 2012: 16–18. The absolute use of *occurrere* leaves it to the reader to supply *Roma*'s purpose from 370 *hortari in proelia*. At 1.185–92 and *Cic. Cat.* 1.18 she confronts her aggressor rather than her defender.

**374–6** Pompey anticipates the narrator's concern for enslaved future generations at 385–445.

**374–5** *credite qui nunc est populus populumque futurum | permixtas afferre preces*: *populus* has been incorporated into its relative clause. Polypotton (*populus populumque*) strengthens the tightly arranged chiasmus of nouns and modifiers which link present and future generations.

**375–6** *haec libera nasci, | haec uult turba mori*: a sententious paradox: highly compressed and evenly balanced (with six syllables in each phrase). *turba*, *libera* and *uult* are all understood in both clauses. Pompey sharpens the vision with anaphora of deictic *haec*, 'pointing out' each imagined crowd to his army. The key contrasting infinitives, each last in their clause, add further force: Pompey ends with the notion of 'dying free', the more pressing concern for his army.

**376–7** *siquis post pignora tanta | Pompeio locus est*: here the third-person self-reference is pathetic (compare grandiosity at e.g. 87–8(n.)); *post pignora tanta* 'after stakes so great' (*OLD pignus* 2) may hint at his cognomen.

**377** *cum prole et coniuge*: appeals to family were a common strategy for stirring pity in forensic oratory (Bablitz 2007: 193), particularly in the peroration (369–76n.). This is not merely rhetoric for Pompey: his deep emotional commitment to his wife and children is a distinguishing characteristic in the poem (Ahl 1976: 173–83).

**378** *imperii salua si maiestate liceret* 'if it were permitted for me to do so with the majesty of my command preserved'; a present, contrary to fact condition. *maiestate* puns on 379 *Magnus*. At 680–1 the narrator will note that Pompey's flees the battle *salua* . . . | *maiestate*. There are models of dignified supplication in the poem: cf. 4.337–43 *supplex Afranius* . . . | *uictoris stetit ante pedes. seruata precanti | maiestas non fracta malis* . . . *et ueniam securo pectore poscit*. It is typical of Pompey to invoke such an extremity of action, only to cite conditions preventing him from following through: cf. 118–19.

**379** *uoluerer ante pedes*: *uoluerer* is passive in the middle sense 'grovel' (*OLD* 3b).



**379–80 Magnus, nisi uincitis, exul, | ludibrium soceri, uester pudor:** cf. 253 (Caesar) ‘*in manibus uestris, quantus sit Caesar, habetis*’. *exul, ludibrium* and *pudor* are in apposition to *Magnus*. The asyndetic list may hint at tragedy (cf. e.g. Sen. *Med.* 20–1 *egens | exul pauens inuisus incerti laris*); chiasmus of nouns and modifiers in *ludibrium soceri, uester pudor* sharpens the contrast between derision and shame. The role of *exul* has already been ascribed to Pompey: 2.708 *Magnus fugiens*, 2.730 *adhuc ingens . . . exul*. At 8.710 Pompey’s corpse will be a *ludibrium pelagi*.

**380–2 ultima fata | deprecor ac turpes extremi cardinis annos, | ne dis-  
cam seruire senex** ‘I beg that this most contemptible fate and disgraceful years at the end of my life may be averted: that I not learn to be a slave in my old age’. Cf. 318–22: Caesar begs (‘*uos tamen hoc oro*’) his soldiers to spare the fleeing, but to disfigure even relatives whom they encountered in the battle. For Caesar there is only victory or suicide (309–10), and he ends his exhortation with the destruction of his own camp (326–9). Pompey’s bathetic anticlimax is that, if defeated, he will live out his twilight years as a subject under Caesar (Ahl 1976: 164–5; 352–3n.). *ultima* ‘worst, meanest’ (*OLD* 9a) also evokes the end period of one’s life (*OLD* 6c); for *deprecor* with a direct object (*fata, annos*) and an explanatory *ut/ne* clause see *TLL* v<sup>1</sup>.600.36–44. *extremi cardinis* ‘the end of one’s life’ (*OLD cardo* 4d). The imagery may derive from the four cardinal points (κέντρα, *cardines*) where the horizon and the meridian intersect the circle of the zodiac (*OLD cardo* 4a): the areas between these points were conceived of as governing four stages of a person’s life: see Housman 1919: 77. For Pompey as *senex* see 352–3n.

**382–4** Cf. the army’s response to his first speech at 2.596 *uerba ducis nullo partes clamore secuntur* and at 127–8 *trepido confusa tumultu | castra fremunt*. Their present response is a paradox. Pompey succeeds now in arousing the army to war because his focus upon freedom and slavery aligns his own concerns with theirs: 386 *metus hos regni* (Ahl 1976: 164–7). *tam maesta locuti | uoce ducis* points also to a response born of pity, the rhetorical goal of his peroration (369–76n.). *flagrant animi*, the unexpectedly fervent reaction, is delayed to the end (παρά προσδοκίαν).

**383–4 Romanaque uirtus | erigitur:** *Romana uirtus* marks highly emotive contexts in Livy (e.g. 5.43.6, 9.6.13, 9.14.10; cf. also Quad. *hist. frag.* 6 Cornell). At Sen. *Ep.* 94.29, the excellence of the human soul is roused (*erigitur uirtus*) by *admonitio*, classed as a kind of exhortation (94.25).

**384 placuitque mori, si uera timeret** ‘they resolved to die in case his apprehensions were well founded’ (*OLD si* 11, *uerus* 8). They were prepared to die on the chance that, if defeated, the fears expressed by Pompey at 376–82 might come to pass (Shackleton Bailey 1982: 96, 1984: 127).



### 385–459 THE NARRATOR REFLECTS ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE BATTLE

Two lines resume the battle narrative only to be interrupted and delayed by seventy-three highly impassioned lines in which the narrator dwells upon the permanent consequences and implications of the battle. The narrator's tirade at 387–459 develops in the following manner. The losses inflicted will be irreparable; Pharsalus will crush future races: desolate towns throughout central Italy will testify to the scale of the casualties (387–99). The present human race is insufficient for these towns and fields. Pharsalus is worse than any previous military disaster (399–411). The generation who fell at Pharsalus could have made good losses from any number of subsequent natural disasters: Fortune arranged this calamity to show Rome how mighty her fall was (411–19). Rome had unmatched military success during the republic: her empire continuously expanded (419–25). Because of Pharsalus there are now regions that will never be incorporated into the Roman empire, and *Libertas* has fled from the Roman lands (426–36). Romans should never have known liberty during the republic: knowledge of it makes the present slavery shameful (437–45). If this was permitted to happen, then there are no gods for the Romans. Chance rules everything and the gods do not care. But Rome has her revenge upon the gods by deifying emperors (445–59).

These are some of the most powerful lines in Lucan's epic, 'the fullest and most agonized expression of this trauma's magnitude and irreversibility' (Day 2013: 197). The high emotional register is sustained by the narrator's exclamations (399–400, 411), counter-factual wishes (436), rhetorical questions (419–20, 440–1, 447–8, 448–51, 451–4), strong images (e.g. 389–90 *gentes Mars iste futuras | obruet*, 405 *mundi faece*, 459 *iurabit Roma per umbras*), paradoxes (410–11, 436, 440, 442–3, 457), apostrophes (418–19, 421–4, 437–9, all addressed to Rome), shocking declarations (445–6 *sunt nobis nulla profecto | numina*, 447 *mentimur regnare Iouem*) and *sententiae* (444–5, 459). They allude to and overturn classic statements from the Augustan poets on the future fame of Italy (391–6n.) and on poetic immortality coexistent with Augustan institutions (397–8n.); and they reprise in the ruined towns of Italy one of the poem's earliest images of the civil war's present-day consequences (400–1; cf. 1.24–9). The tirade is further marked by multiple changes in viewpoint – looking forward from the day of the battle to future disaster (387–96), looking back on past time from the narrator's own present (397–8), surveying present conditions (398–400) – to give 'a consistent sweeping movement, deploying a variety of perspectives to evoke the significance for Lucan's Rome of the coming battle' (Leigh 1997a: 93). On these lines see

Ahl 1976: 215–18; Johnson 1987: 86–90; Leigh 1997a: 82–99; Gowing 2005: 92–4; Day 2013: 197–210.

**385** *ergo* introduces a resumption of narrative (*OLD* 5a).

**385–6** *pari . . . motu | irarum* ‘with an equal impulse to anger’ (ablative of manner), a mild paradox explained by the following *sententia*. Anger was widely regarded as necessary for effective battle (see Tarrant on Virg. A. 12.108; Braund and Gilbert 2003).

**386** *metus hos regni, spes excitat illos*: Pompeians and Caesarians respectively; the two clauses share *regni* and *excitat* (ἐπὶ κοινού). *metus . . . regni* effectively glosses 384 *si uera timeret* (n.) and looks back to Pompey’s own fears; *excitat* recalls 384 *erigitur*. Hope was a leitmotif of Caesar’s exhortation (251, 255, 297(n.)); at 240 he was *flagrans cupidine regni*. Thus prospective readers of the poem (211), generals and now the soldiers, share the same emotions (Leigh 1997a: 86; Day 2013: 90).

**387–99** Pharsalus will inflict permanent and irreparable casualties. At issue is not the number killed but that so much *Roman* blood will be spilled, as emerges at 391–99, 402–7 and cf. 580–5: ‘the irreparable loss is the loss of the true Roman stock, the old race of the Latium they left desolate’ (Mackay 1952: 148). At 1.67–82 the civil war had been compared to a conflagration of the universe, with any notion of regeneration suppressed (Lapidge 1979; cf. Roche 2005); the permanent consequences of battle are reprised at 640 *in totum mundi prosternimur aeuum*.

**387–8** *hae facient dextrae, quidquid non expleat aetas | ulla* ‘these hands will accomplish what no passage of time can make good’. *non . . . ulla* emphatically negates *aetas* (*OLD* 7). A number of attempts have been made to interpret or emend these lines. *quidquid* is difficult because its usual meaning is ‘whatever’, ‘all that’, which here makes no sense. Housman’s solution was to emend the text and delete 388 so that it reads *hae facient dextrae, quidquid nona explicat aetas | ut uacet a ferro* ‘these hands will bring to pass that, whatever the ninth century unfolds, it shall be free from warfare’. He explains that the eighth century of the city had been closed with the secular games given by Claudius, and that Lucan’s point is that in his own time, the ninth century, the men who might have fought in wars were never born because of the losses inflicted at Pharsalus. Axelson 1959 suggested emending *quidquid non* to *quae damna haud* ‘losses which no [passage of time can make good]’. Bradley 1969 suggested understanding *quidquid* to refer to 386 *irarum* to give ‘These right hands will perpetrate acts of violence of such a kind that no age can match nor human kind renew’ (with *expleat* ‘make up’); he further suggested emending 389 *ut uacet a ferro* to *ut uacet ad ferrum* ‘though it devote itself to war

[for all time]’. However, the manuscript authority of *quidquid non* is very strong (ΩC) and its awkwardness makes it an unlikely correction from an easier reading (cf. Bradley 1969: 180 ‘The difficulty of *quidquid* provides some measure of guarantee that this is what Lucan wrote’). I favour the interpretation of Håkanson 1982: 239–41, who argued that the notion of *posse* is inherent in *expleat* and *reparet* as potential subjunctives, and that *quidquid* thus has the force of (*id*) *quod omnino non* (‘that which in no way’). This idiom is found in declamation (e.g. [Quint.] *Decl.* 5.21 *unde enim euenit, quicquid ante captiuitas tua praestare non potuit?* ‘For how did this thing happen which you as a captive could not at all achieve earlier?’, 8.15, 15.8). See further Housman xxiii–xxv; MacKay 1952; Axelson 1959; Bradley 1969.

**388** ‘nor the race of man repair in all time to come’ (trans. Housman (xxiv), who deleted this line, see 387–8n.).

**389** *ut uacet a ferro* ‘even if it remain free from warfare’; *ut* is concessive (*OLD* 35). *gentes . . . futuras* ‘the future human race’ (*OLD* 2b).

**390** *obruet* ‘will overwhelm’ (*OLD* 4a).

**390–1** The next generation, unborn children of men killed at Pharsalus.

**391** *erepto natale feret* ‘will carry [them off], the possibility of their birth snatched away’ (*OLD natalis*<sup>2</sup> 5, *fero* 35d).

**391–6** Cf. Virg. *A.* 6.773–6 (Anchises on the future youth of Italy) *‘hi tibi Nomentum et Gabios urbemque Fidenam, | hi Collatinas imponent montibus arces, | Pometios Castrumque Inui Bolamque Coramque; | haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae’*. All of the towns in Anchises’ prophecy had, in Virgil’s day, long been in radical decline, brought about through the rising dominance of Rome itself. In *BC* the civil war is blamed for a devastation of Italy’s cities which had happened long ago (Ahl 1976: 215–19; Feeney 1986a: 7–8; Leigh 1997a: 82–9). Virgil had paradoxically inverted the ‘famous once’ topos by looking at cities before they were renowned; Lucan crushingly reverts to the standard perspective and explains what destroyed them. Italy’s desolation, resulting from the civil war, is one of the poem’s earliest images: 1.24–32. Lucan’s ‘catalogue’ is under the heading *omne Latinum nomen*, but includes Etruscan Veii (closer to Rome than Cora): strict consistency is less important than the status of these municipalities as once-powerful cities subsumed by Rome’s expansion.

**391–2** *tunc omne Latinum | fabula nomen erit* answers Anchises (Virg. *A.* 6.776; see 391–6n.), whose soon-to-be-famous towns without names will be reduced to nothing but a *fabula* (‘a mere name, a thing of the past’, *OLD* 5b). The phrase also establishes a link between Pompey (1.35

*magni nominis umbra*) and the devastation of Italy, both ‘ruins of their former selves’ (Day 2013: 212). In *BC* names regularly point to insubstantiality or the discrepancy between names and their referents. *nomen Latinum* evokes the common name of the communities of Latium Vetus; these shared social and legal rights in a political and military federation for which the modern term is ‘Latin League’ (see Cornell *CAH* vii<sup>2</sup>.264–74). They were in a defensive military alliance with Rome from the early fifth to mid-fourth century; the Latin League was dissolved in 338 after its defeat by Rome in the Latin War. With the founding of Latin colonies outside Latium (Cales was the first example in 334), *Latinus* came to denote legal status (*OLD* 3) rather than ethnicity or geography (*OLD* 1a).

**392** For the location of these towns see Barrington 43C2, B1, D3. **Gabios:** 19 km east of Rome. It was desolate for Cicero (*Planc.* 23), proverbially so for Horace (*Ep.* 1.11.7). **Veiosque:** 16 km north of Rome in southern Etruria. It was destroyed by the Romans and its territory annexed in 396. Its magnificent past contrasted with its contemporary, much reduced, municipal status (Prop. 4.10.29–30 with Hutchinson). **Coramque:** c. 60 km south-east of Rome, on the western border of Latium Vetus in the Monti Lepini. It had been in decline since the fourth century. Florus (1.11.6) asks incredulously *quis credat?* as he records that it and Alsium were once formidable.

**393** ‘their dust-covered ruins will hardly be able to reveal’.

**394 Albanosque lares Laurentinosque penates:** the list climaxes with grand periphrases evoking the Italy of the *Aeneid*. The present dilapidated state of these towns suggests an undoing of the labours of Aeneas and his descendants. Alba Longa (south-east of Rome) was founded by Ascanius in the version favoured by Virgil (*A.* 1.267–71, 8.42–8). Its line of kings connected the time of Aeneas and the founding of Rome; a number of patrician families traced their origins to the city (*VE* s.v. ‘Alba Longa’, ‘Alban Kings’). *Laurentinosque penates* may denote a single city in balance with Alba Longa, if so perhaps Lavinium (30 km south-east of Rome), the Laurentine capital founded by Aeneas; or perhaps Laurentum, the purported name of Latinus’ capital, whose historical existence is dubious (Cato *hist. frag.* 5 with Cornell; *EV* s.v. ‘Laurentes’). It may more generally denote the *ager Laurens*, south-east of Rome: landfall of Aeneas and site of archaic Latin settlements; long desolate but under development in the early principate (*OCD* s.v. ‘Laurentum’; Purcell 1998: 12–14; cf. also Horsfall 1990: 526–7).

**395–6 rus uacuum, quod non habitat nisi nocte coacta | inuitus questusque Numam iussisse senator** ‘an empty country which no senator inhabits except unwillingly on the night ordained, complaining of the

decree of Numa' (Braund). *rus uacuum* (accusative in apposition to *lares* and *penates*) 'takes up, and strips of ambivalence, Vergil's *terrae*' (A. 6.776, see 391–6n.; Feeney 1986a: 8). *quod non habitat* is a relative clause of characteristic. *nocte coacta* 'on the night required by law' (*OLD coactus* 3b). The *Feriae Latinae* was the annual festival of the Latin League, held at the sanctuary of Jupiter Latiaris at Alba Longa. Some thought it was instituted by Tarquinius Superbus, others held that it originated with Faunus, or after the death of Latinus or Aeneas (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.49.1–3; *Schol. Bob. Cic. Planc.* 23 pp. 154–5 Strangl). Consuls and all magistrates down to the tribunes of the plebs were required to attend the ceremony before the consuls could set out on campaign (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 8.87.6). This is clearly the regulation to which Lucan alludes: although no other source connects it with Numa, many legal and religious institutions and practices were credited to him. On the *Feriae Latinae* see Weinstock 1971: 320–5; Scullard 1981: 111–15; Smith 2012: 267–88. At 1.550–2 the festival's closing bonfire becomes a portent of war, while at 5.400–2 the narrator claims that Jupiter Latiaris no longer deserves the festival after Caesar's subjugation of Latium.

**397–8 non aetas haec carpsit edax monumentaque rerum | putria destituit: crimen ciuile uidemus** recalls Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.1–5 *Exegi monumentum aere perennius | regalique situ pyramidum altius, | quod non imber edax, non aquilo impotens | possit diruere aut innumerabilis | annorum series et fuga temporum* and Ov. *Met.* 15.871–2 *iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iouis ira nec ignis | nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere uetustas*. These passages are alluded to again at 9.980–6 in the context of Lucan's (and Caesar's) poetic immortality. They establish a nexus in the poem between the permanent devastation caused by the war and the poet's imperishable fame: an inversion of the Augustan poets' claim to an immortality linked with the survival of Augustan Rome and her institutions (Leigh 1997a: 89–91). Note the change in tense from 387–96; the narrator now looks back from his own present vantage point. *non aetas haec carpsit edax*: take *haec* with *monumenta*; *non* negates *aetas*: the agent of decay was not time but the *crimen ciuile*. This clause produces a momentary paradox (reading *non* with *carpsit*) that time has not eroded, i.e. has preserved, disintegrating monuments. *monumentaque rerum | putria destituit* 'and abandoned these monuments of our exploits to disintegrate' (*OLD res* 7b, *destituo* 2c; *putria* is predicative with consecutive force); compare Gowing 2005: 94 'war wipes out not only the Republic, but the very means by which the memory of the Republic could be passed on from one generation to the next'. It can also mean 'and set up these disintegrating monuments of our exploits' (*OLD destituo* 1): a refined paradox by which the ruination of the cities of Italy is itself cast as a *monumentum*, drawing its viewer's attention back to the

origin of this decay in the *crimen ciuile* (cf. Var. *L.* 6.49 on the etymological group *meminisse, memoria, monere* and *monumentum*): the contemplation of Italy's contemporary ruins circumvents Caesar's annihilation of history. On memory in *BC* see Gowing 2005: 82–96; Thorne 2011.

**398–9 crimen ciuile uidemus | tot uacuas urbes:** *crimen* 'reproach' as well as 'crime' (*OLD* 2a, 4). The switch to present and first person plural aligns the narrator's vision with that of his audience and brings the contemporary reader a step closer again. *uidemus* is also a strategy of authenticating the claims of 387–9 by an appeal to the evidence of his readers' own senses.

**399–400 generis quo turba redacta est | humani!** 'To what state has humanity's multitude been reduced!' This exclamation marks the beginning of a new section, 399–411 on the contemporary Italian effects of the casualties suffered at Pharsalus. The hyperbole *genus humanum* is misleadingly inclusive: the lament is for lost *Roman* blood (387–99n.); the city is teeming at 405.

**400–4** Cf. 1.24–9 *at nunc semirutis pendent quod moenia tectis | urbibus Italiae lapsisque ingentia muris | saxa iacent nulloque domus custode tenentur | rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat, | horrida quod dumis multosque inarata per annos | Hesperia est desuntque manus poscentibus aruis.*

**400–1 toto populi qui nascimur orbe | nec muros implere uiris nec possumus agros:** the hyperbaton *toto . . . orbe* emphasizes the adjective and sharpens the image of a world-population which is essential for the paradox to follow. *muros* 'walled towns' (*OLD* 1b). *agros* 'fields' evokes cultivable land (*OLD* 4a), a theme to be developed at 402–4.

**402 urbs nos una capit:** an epigrammatic sequel to 400–1. *urbs . . . una* answers *toto . . . orbe*. The ancients believed *urbs* derived from *orbis*, and juxtaposing them was very common (see Hollis on Ov. *Ars* 1.174; Maltby 1991: 655). *capit* 'contains' (*OLD* 25a) balances 401 *implere*.

**402–3 uincto fossore coluntur | Hesperiae segetes** 'Hesperia's ploughlands are tilled by shackled labour'; the emotive adjective *Hesperiae* carries the force of the affront. That Italy (or large portions of it) were either deserted or populated only by slaves was a cliché in the late republic and early empire: see Oakley on Liv. 6.12.5. Lucan's image of estates worked by chain gangs is the antithesis of the Roman ideal of the farmer-citizen-soldier who works his own smallholding (*OCD* s.v. 'agriculture'; Spencer 2010: 13 with references). *uincto* is the reading of **PG**; *uicto* **ZMC** and *iuncto* **UV** are easy corruptions (*TLL* vii<sup>2</sup>.653.53–5); *uinctus fossor* is at Ov. *Tr.* 4.1.5 and *Pont.* 1.6.31.

**403–4** *stat tectis putris auitis | in nullos ruitura domus* ‘there stands the home, its roof bequeathed by ancestors now crumbling, about to fall on no one’; *tectis*: ablative of respect with *putris*. The salient detail *auitis* denotes long-standing, continuous possession by the same family (*TLL* II.1442.27–8): these are houses possessed by citizens killed in the civil war. The clause offers a momentary image of desolation in contrast with the wider view of the congested city described in the following lines. Details recall Pompey and the old oak tree to which he is compared in book 1 (1.135 *stat*, 1.141 *casura*).

**404–6** *nulloque frequentem | ciue suo Romam sed mundi faece repletam | cladis eo dedimus*: the climax in both length (6 < 7 < 11 feet) and intensity of the tricolon begun at 402 (*uincto*). The object phrase *nulloque* . . . *repletam* is organized around modifiers at line ending and the direct object *Romam* at the main caesura. *nullo*, placed early for emphasis, echoes and explains *in nullos*. *nulloque frequentem | ciue suo* appears fleetingly to extend the image of deserted houses at 404 to a depopulated city: an impression radically corrected by *mundi faece repletam* ‘filled to the brim with the dregs of the earth’ (cf. Cic. *Pis.* 9 *ex omni faece urbis ac seruitio*). *faex* is residue at the bottom of a wine jar (or sim.); to be filled up with dregs is a paradox. *repletam* also sardonically suggests ‘restored to full number’ (*OLD* 2a) after the citizen losses of Pharsalus. *cladis eo dedimus* ‘we have consigned to such a point of disaster’ (*OLD eo*<sup>2</sup> 2, *do*<sup>2</sup> 20a).

**406–7** *ne tanto in corpore bellum | iam possit ciuile geri*: for negative consecutive clauses introduced by *ne* (rather than *ut non*) cf. *TLL* IX<sup>1</sup>.305.58–306.35 (and e.g. Liv. 26.24.16 *Philippum* . . . *satis implicatum bello finitimo ratus ne Italiam* . . . *posset respicere*). *corpus* is the body politic (*OLD* 6c); Rome is estimated to have had approximately 1,000,000 inhabitants in this period (*OCD* s.v. ‘population, Roman’).

**407–8** *Pharsalia tanti | causa mali*: cf. Virg. *A.* 6.93–4 (the Sibyl) ‘*causa mali tanti coniunx iterum hospita Teucris | externique iterum thalami*’, 11.479–80 *Lavinia uirgo*, | *causa mali tanti*.

**408–9** *cedant feralia nomina Cannae | et damnata diu Romanis Allia fastis*: sites of military catastrophes inflicted by Hannibal on 2 August 216 and by the Gauls on 18 July 390 respectively. Caesar is associated with both of these historical enemies in *BC* (Hannibal: Day 2013: 116–33; Gauls: Hodges 2004: 24–58). The gravity of these defeats was considered comparable (Liv. 22.50.1 *cladi nobilitate par*). *cedant* ‘let them grant superiority’, sc. to Pharsalus in significance (*OLD cedo* 8d; *TLL* III.730.19–22). *feralia* ‘ill-omened’ (*OLD* 3b), uniquely collocated with *nomina* in Classical Latin. *damnata diu Romanis* . . . *fastis* and the following lines suggest that these were *dies nefasti*, but they were not: the anniversaries of defeats were *dies*



*religiosi*, a different category, and not marked on the calendar; the error was common (Gell. 4.9.5; N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.1).

**410–11 tempora signauit leuiorum Roma malorum, | hunc uoluit nescire diem:** *tempora signauit* ‘marked the dates’. In fact both the *Fasti Amiternini* (post-15 CE) and the *Fasti Antiates* (c. 31 CE) record Pharsalus as a victory (CAES C F PHARSALI DEVICIT; cf. *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.244, 248). The theme of wishing to forget Pharsalus or withholding its commemoration is further developed in book 7 at 552–6 in the refusal to narrate the central battle between Romans; and at 849–50 (the narrator to Thessaly) *quod sufficit aeuum | immemor ut donet belli tibi damna uetustas?*

**411 pro tristia fata!** This interjection is unique to Lucan; it appears also at 5.57 (Ptolemy’s recognition as king of Egypt by the senate) and 6.305 (Pompey does not attack Caesar after Dyrrachium). It marks the beginning of a new section, 411–19 on the losses from subsequent disasters that could have been made good by the men who died at Pharsalus.

**412–19** A long compound sentence. The main clause (412–15) comprises five consecutive object phrases; this is followed by a long relative clause (415–19), itself containing a temporal clause (416–18 *dum* . . . *campis*) and a second relative clause expressing purpose (418–19 *per quos* . . . *cadas*).

**412 aera pestiferum tractu** ‘air noxious to inhale’ (*OLD* *traho* 7b). **morbosque fluentes:** in medical contexts *fluens* denotes flux, liquefaction or putrefaction. Celsus (1 pr. 55) classifies diseases into three *genera*: *astriatum* (bringing constriction), *fluens* and mixed.

**413 insanamque famem:** cf. Virg. *A.* 9.340 *uesana fames*; *insanus* ‘mad-denying’ is more regularly applied to fear or grief (*TLL* VII.1835.8–18). **permissasque ignibus urbes** ‘cities yielded up to the flames’; cf. Sil. 12.423 (Hannibal at Acerra) *permisit flammis atque ensibus urbem*.

**414 moeniaque in praeceps laturos plena tremores** ‘earthquakes that will inflict headlong ruin on full cities’; *moenia* is synecdoche for *urbes*. Italy was (and still is) prone to earthquakes. Pompeii was hit by one in 62, which Tacitus says destroyed a large part of the town (*Ann.* 15.22.2).

**415 hi possunt explere uiri:** *explere* ‘to satisfy the demands of’ (*OLD* 3a; *ASL*; cf. 404–6n. on *repletam*). In this pathetic context and in contrast with the present-day *mundi faex*, *hi* . . . *uiri* is a term of approbation: ‘these real men’ (*OLD* 3). The reading *possunt* **PGV** is best: (i) it has much better manuscript authority than *poscunt* **Z** or *possint* **M** (whose reading is unclear); (ii) although *possent* **Z**<sup>2</sup>**UC** could also balance the negated



potential of 387–8 *non expleat aetas* | *ulla*, the indicative *possunt* reflects the narrator's point of view, which now reverts to that of 387–96: on the day of battle, looking forward in time (cf. 397–8n.). *traxit* 'has dragged down' (present time, completed aspect).

**416–17 *dum munera longi* | *explicat eripiens aeui*** 'while she deploys and snatches away the gifts of long ages'. *munera*, often used of endowments (*OLD* 5b), here denotes both the men who die at Pharsalus and their potential as fathers of Roman sons. *explicare* is a military term (*OLD* 4a, as at 6.9) figuring *Fortuna* as a general; *Fortuna*'s gift is a cliché (*TLL* VIII.1664.60). The temporal span of *longi* | . . . *aeui* balances the geographical extent of 415 *undique*.

**417–18 *populosque ducesque* | *constituit campis***: *constituit* 'stations' (present after *dum*), a technical military term (*TLL* IV.513.44; 416–17n.); *populosque ducesque* each make uncommon objects for *constituit*.

**418–19 *per quos tibi, Roma, ruenti* | *ostendat quam magna cadas*** 'through whom to show you as you collapse, Rome, how great a thing you are that falls'; a relative clause of purpose. Cf. 131–3; see also Hor. *Epod.* 16.2 *suis et ipsa Roma uiribus ruit, aduenisse diem qui fatum rebus in aeuum* | *conderet humanis, et quaeri, Roma quid esset, | illo Marte, palam est. ruere and cadere* each regularly describe the collapsing fortunes of states (*OLD* ruo 7, *cado* 10) and the individual's death in battle (*OLD* ruo 6c, *cado* 9). *Fortuna*'s purpose that Rome recognize her own magnificence as she collapses in the Roman casualties at Pharsalus is a goal that moves in step with Lucan's own poetic project. At 556 *Roma* is identified with the Roman combatants. For the language of self-reflection here cf. Sen. *Clem.* 1.1 *ut . . . te tibi ostenderem*.

**419–25** Rome's dominion over the world before Pharsalus. Details are echoed in the narrator's lament over Pompey at 8.701, 8.703–4 (Day 2013: 220–1).

**419–20 *quae latius orbem* | *possedit***: *quae* (subject of both *possedit* and *cucurrit*) agrees with *urbs*, understood from *Roma*; for the phrase cf. 1.109–10 (*fortuna*) *populique potentis, | quae mare, quae terras, quae totum possidet orbem*.

**420 *citius per prospera fata cucurrit*** 'made more rapid progress [i.e. from achievement to achievement] through prosperity' (*OLD* curro 6b; Housman *ad loc.*); cf. 5.239 (Caesar's success) *fatorum tantos per prospera cursus*, 8.701–2 (Pompey's earlier success) *hac Fortuna fide Magni tam prospera fata | pertulit*. I have not been able to find a parallel for the striking phrase *per fata currere*.

**421–2 omne tibi bellum gentes dedit, omnibus annis | te geminum Titan procedere uidit in axem:** theme and variation. The second, expansive, clause is dignified by anaphora (*omne . . . omnibus*), polyptoton (*omne tibi . . . omnibus . . . | te*), the elevated metonym *Titan* for *sol* (2n.), and by the unusual periphrasis *geminum . . . in axem*, ‘towards the twin regions of the sky’ (*OLD axis* 5b). This last phrase would normally suggest ‘north and south’ (cf. *OLD* 4) but here denotes the extremities of east and west (*Comm. Bern.*; cf. 3.359 *Hesperium . . . ad axem*, 4.62 (of Eurys) *suo . . . in axe*), the usual coordinates for expressing Roman expansion, as at Sen. *Ben.* 3.33.3 *Romani imperii sine aemulo ad ortus occasusque uenturi*; Petr. 119.1–2 *orbem iam totum uictor Romanus habebat, | qua mare, qua terrae, qua sidus currit utrumque* (i.e. the rising and setting sun). *gentes* ‘foreign nations’, as often in Lucan (e.g. 1.465 with Housman; *TLL* vi.1850.31–75). The sun is invoked both as traversing the entire east–west extent of the earth and as panoptic witness (Enn. *trag.* 234 with Jocelyn; Virg. *A.* 12.176 with Tarrant).

**423 haud multum terrae spatium restabat Eoae:** *terrae . . . Eoae* (partitive genitive) alludes to Parthia; rhetorical needs compel the narrator to diminish the extent of the unconquered world from 1.9–20.

**424 ut tibi nox, tibi tota dies, tibi curreret aether:** *currere* describes the swift movement of heavenly bodies (*OLD* 4b). The emotive, threefold repetition of *tibi* (dative of advantage) expresses the conceit that the heavens nearly moved exclusively over the extent of Rome’s empire; *tota dies* implies from sunrise to sunset. The *aether* is the location of the fixed stars (2–3n.); it will contrast with *errantes stellae* in the following line (425n.). *nox* and *dies* may suggest ‘moon’ and ‘sun’ respectively to give a complete catalogue of astronomical bodies in 424–5.

**425 omniaque errantes stellae Romana uiderent:** *Romana* is predicative. *errantes stellae* is the standard technical term for planets (πλανήτες ἀστέρες) in contrast to the fixed stars; Lucan preserves the same distinction at 9.12–13 (Pompey’s *manes*) *stellasque uagas miratus et astra | fixa polis* (see Kidd 1966). Housman’s influential view was that *errantes stellae* meant not planets, but all of the stars, including fixed stars. However, he could not cite parallels with *errare* (only *uagus* and *uagari*), and Kidd has shown that Lucan is building a catalogue of astronomical bodies in 424–5 (moon, sun, fixed stars, planets) in which the distinction between *aether* as the location of fixed stars and *errantes stellae* as ‘planets’ is meaningful.

**426–7 sed retro tua fata tulit par omnibus annis | Emathiae funesta dies** ‘but the fatal day of Emathia, a match for all those years [*sc.* of good fortune], undid your destiny’ (lit. ‘bore it backwards’). *retro* is common in figurative expressions of retrogression (*OLD* 1c); cf. Virg. *G.* 1.199–200

*sic omnia fatis* | *in peius ruere ac retro sublapsa referri*. Here *par* suggests opponents in battle or in the arena (*OLD* 11d, 12–13), the latter being a prominent metaphor running through the poem: cf. esp. 695 (Ahl 1976: 86–8; Masters 1992: 35, 44, 109–10, 155; Leigh 1997a: 234–43). *omnibus annis* echoes 421 and is balanced by *funesta dies*, a favourite of Cicero (e.g. *Sest.* 27 *diem illum . . . funestum senatui*).

**427–8 hac luce cruenta | effectum, ut Latios non horreat India fascēs:** *effectum* (impersonal) introduces a result clause in primary sequence. India can evoke the extremities of the earth (Virg. *G.* 2.123 *extremi sinus orbis*) or refer inclusively to eastern campaigning more generally (as at Virg. *A.* 7.605). It also suggests the campaigns of Alexander the Great, whose world-empire is a competitive point of comparison, particularly for Caesar: cf. 10.20–52, esp. 47–52, 10.457 (Caesar) *paruaque regna putet Tyriis cum Gadibus Indos*.

**429 nec uetitos errare Dahae in moenia ducat:** the subject of this and the following clause is 430 *succinctus consul*. The Dahae (*NP* s.v.) were a nomadic tribe (hence *errare*; cf. 1.253 *errantesque domos*) originating from east of the Caspian Sea; they appear on the shield of Aeneas (8.728 *indomitique Dahae*) and had been active in internal conflicts within Parthia in Lucan's lifetime (Tac. *Ann.* 11.8.4). *in moenia ducat* may be doubly apt: it denotes the curtailing of a nomadic lifestyle ('settle in their own cities'), but it may also suggest their being led in triumph at Rome (cf. 279–80n.).

**430 Sarmaticumque premat succinctus consul aratrum:** i.e. to demarcate a new *colonia* in Sarmatian lands by ritually ploughing a furrow around the proposed site. *succinctus* alludes to the ritual arrangement of the toga for this purpose (the *ritus Gabinus*) wherein part of the garment covers the head and the rest is tucked up; cf. Man. 4.556 *moenia succinctus curuo describet aratro* (on this ritual see Cato *hist.* fr. 66 with Cornell; Varr. *L.* 5.143; Eckstein 1981: 87–8). The consul was not required to carry out the *aratrum* ritual (although in the republic he played a leading role in the disposition of *ager publicus*, such as the territory of a defeated nation: Pina-Polo 2011: 169–87); here and (understood as subject) at 429 *consul* is synecdoche for republican Rome. The Sarmatae (*OCD* s.v.) were a group of nomadic tribes whose most prominent peoples came to occupy the Danube estuary (the Roxolani: Barrington 23B1) and the plain between the middle Danube and the Theiss (the Iazyges: Barrington 21B3). There was some contemporary military action against them (*ILS* 982 (mid-60s) *Motum orientem Sarmatum compressit*).

**431 quod semper saeuas debet tibi Parthia poenas:** cf. 1.8–12 (with Roche on 1.10–12); Ov. *Ars* 1.179 *Parthe, dabis poenas: Crassi gaudete sepulti. semper* 'still and forever' (Braund). Two further results are now expressed

by *quod* + ind. (A–G §572); the change in mood presents these statements as undisputed facts by comparison with the previous subjunctive clauses (for the relationship between subjunctive result clauses and the potential subjunctive see NLS §§136–7); slowing metre adds emphasis.

**432–6** The loss of political freedom with the emergence of the principate is recast allegorically as the self-imposed exile of a personified *Libertas* from the territory of the Roman empire. The allegory recalls Δίκη/*Iustitia*/Astraea's desertion of the earth at the beginning of the Bronze Age: with 432 *redituraque numquam* cf. esp. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.6 *iam redit et Virgo* (cf. Hes. *Op.* 197–200; Arat. *Phaen.* 96–8, 105; Virg. *G.* 2.473–4; Ov. *Met.* 15.149–50; *NP* s.v. 'Astraea'; *OCD* s.v. 'Dike'). This final consequence has more space than the four preceding consequences combined; it is structured around a falling tricolon and is capped by the narrator's wish that she had never been known: this final paradoxical wish begins the transition to lines 437–45 in which the theme of Roman servitude is developed.

**433 ultra Tigrim Rhenumque:** coupled with other rivers as borders of exile at Sen. *Her. F.* 1324; the Euphrates more commonly denoted the eastern edge of the Roman world (e.g. Sen. *Nat.* 1 pr. 9; Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.89–90). In Tacitus political servitude is regularly contrasted with the freedom enjoyed by tribes living beyond the borders of the empire: see e.g. Woodman 2014: 20–2.

**434 totiens nobis iugulo quaesita** 'sought by us at the price of death so many times'; i.e. Roman freedom was acquired and maintained at the cost of her own blood in wars against foreign nations (cf. *Comm. Bern.*: *tot bellis acquisita*). *iugulo* sc. *nostror*: cf. 309 *sors quaesita manu*, 9.1022 *accipe regna Phari nullo quaesita cruore*. *nobis* is dative of agent; the metonym *iugulum* for *caedes* is favoured by Lucan (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.638.53–7). **uagatur** is the *mot juste* for exilic wandering (Serv. on A. 1.2 *exul qui adhuc uagatur*, citing Sal. *Hist.* 5.17 *qui nullo certo exilio uagabantur*).

**435 Germanum Scythicumque bonum** 'a blessing for the German and the Scythian', in apposition to *Libertas*, the national adjectives in chiasmus with *Tigrim Rhenumque*.

**435–6 nec respicit ultra | Ausoniam:** *respicit* 'looks back at' the country from which she is exiled (cf. Hardie on Ov. *Met.* 15.685–7); perhaps also 'shows concern for' (*OLD* 8b), often of divinities, as at Virg. *Ecl.* 1.27 *Libertas, quae sera tamen respexit inertem*; cf. also Virg. A. 4.236 (Jupiter on the exiled Aeneas) '*nec prolem Ausoniam et Lauinia respicit arua?*'

**436 uellem populis incognita nostris:** a paradox to conclude the line of thought begun at 427; the following lines will offer explanation. The imperfect potential subjunctive introduces a wish that can no longer be

fulfilled (NLS §121). For a wish appended to a sentence see Oakley 2007: 526, citing this example among others.

**437–9 uulturis ut primum laeum fundata uolatu | Romulus infami com-  
pleuit moenia luco, | usque ad Thessalicas seruissēs, Roma, ruinas:** *ut primum* ‘from the time when . . . first’ (OLD *ut* 27). Details from the city’s mythological foundation – augury (cf. Liv. 1.7.1 with Ogilvie), given weight by hyperbaton, and the Asylum (cf. Liv. 1.8.5–6) – elevate the register in 437–8 before *seruissēs* ‘if only you had been a slave’ and the crushing *ruinas* (cf. 418 *Roma, ruenti* at line ending). The left-hand side was favourable in Roman augury (Cic. *Div.* 2.82), *laeum fundata uolatu* may nevertheless hint at an unpropitious foundation (OLD *laeum* 4a). For *fundare* ‘lay the foundations of’ cf. Virg. A. 4.260 *Aenean fundantem arces*. *infami* is transferred to the Asylum (cf. Virg. A. 8.342–3 *lucum ingentem, quem Romulus acer asyllum | rettulit*) from the people who took refuge in it (e.g. Liv. 1.8.5–6 *turba omnis sine discrimine, liber an seruus esset auida nouarum rerum perfugit*).

**440 de Brutis, Fortuna, queror:** L. Iunius Brutus was normally an object of veneration as the founder of the political freedom of the republic, as at 6.791 *consul depulsis prime tyrannis*; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.1 *libertatem et consulatum L. Brutus instituit*. Johnson 1987: 89 read the plural as literal (‘the two Brutuses have mocked us with the illusion of freedom by pretending to free us from our tyrants’).

**440–1 quid tempora legum | egimus aut annos a consule nomen habentes?** ‘Why did we experience times of legality or years taking their name from the consul?’ Each object phrase measures republican freedom from beginning to end and points to constituent features of liberty as opposed to *regnum*; cf. Liv. 2.1.1 *liberi iam hinc populi Romani res pace belloque gestas, annuos magistratus, imperiaque legum potentiora quam hominum peragam*. During the principate the consul’s power was eclipsed by the emperor’s but the system of consular dating continued (OCD s.v. ‘consul’), as Lucan indicates at 5.397–9 (Caesar’s consulship for 48) *inde perit primum quondam ueneranda potestas | iuris inops; tantum careat ne nomine tempus | menstruus in fastos distinguit saecula consul*.

**442–3 felices Arabes Medique Eoaeque tellus, | quam sub perpetuis tenuerunt fata tyrannis:** cf. 6.301–2 *felix ac libera regem, | Roma, fores* (had Pompey defeated Caesar at Dyrrachium): these lines may constitute the most radical reworking of the term *felix* in the poem (an important thematic word, × 44 in *BC*; see Henderson 1987: 128–9). *felices Arabes* may well evoke for Lucan’s readers Arabia Felix, named for its fertility and good fortune (OLD 1b, 3e), and suggest tyranny as a radically different cause of its *felicitas*. *Eoaeque tellus* denotes Parthia (as at 423 *terrae . . . Eoae*):

for the grouping cf. Sen. *Med.* 711-10 (transposed lines) *diuites Arabes . . . | pharetraque pugnax Medus aut Parthi leues*. The hyperbaton *sub perpetuis . . . tyrannis* (i.e. a perpetual sequence) emphasizes the adjective.

**444-5 ex populis qui regna ferunt sors ultima nostra est, | quos seruire pudet:** *ex* is partitive: 'of' (*OLD* 17). *ultima* 'the worst' (for *sors ultima* cf. 380 *ultima fata*). *quos seruire pudet* is causal (*OLD* qui 22a). Cicero offers a more expansive statement on this theme at *Phil.* 3.36 *nihil foedius seruitute. ad decus et ad libertatem nati sumus: aut haec teneamus aut cum dignitate moriamur . . . iucundiores autem faciet libertatem seruitutis recordatio*, *Phil.* 6.19 *aliae nationes seruitutem pati possunt, populi Romani est propria libertas*.

**445-6 sunt nobis nulla profecto | numina** 'without question there are no gods for us'; *nobis* 'for us Romans' (as opposed to 'for the human race', so *Comm. Bern.*); the enjambed key term *numina* comes as a shock and abruptly reveals this new line of thought. This is not an outright denial of the existence of gods but a denial of their care for the Romans, as the following lines and esp. 454-5 make clear; cf. Feeney 1991: 282 'a position that is scarcely to be distinguished from the teachings of Epicurus: the gods exist but have no care for human affairs, and events in the world are therefore random chance'. For the view that this is an outright denial see Due 1962: 101-2 and 1970: 213-14. For the view that Lucan is flirting with an atheist position here, to be modified at 454-5, see Gagliardi 1985: 2054; Johnson 1987: 89-90; Leigh 1997a: 98. For similar denials of the gods or of their regard for humanity cf. Sen. *Med.* 1027 (Jason to Medea) '*testare nullos esse, qua ueheris, deos*'; Accius 142-3 Ribbeck (*Antigone*) '*iam iam neque di regunt | neque profecto deum supremus rex curat hominibus*'; Oakley on Liv. 8.6.5 and 2007: 569 collects a number of further examples.

**446-7 cum caeco rapiantur saecula casu | mentimur regnare Iouem:** pointedly reversing Hor. *Carm.* 3.5.1-2 *Caelo tonantem credidimus Iouem | regnare* (with Leigh 1997a: 93-4). The polemical word is *mentimur* 'we lie' (*OLD* 4), enjambed for emphasis and initiating five long syllables. The line is echoed at 487 *rapit omnia casus. caecus* 'random' (*OLD* 3a), as at Cic. *Div.* 2.15 *quod temere fit caeco casu et uolubilitate fortunae*.

**447-8 spectabit ab alto | aethere Thessalicas, teneat cum fulmina, caedes?** an important model here is Iarbas' prayer to Jupiter at Virg. *A.* 4.206-18; cf. esp. 208-9 '*aspicis haec? an te, genitor, cum fulmina torques, | nequiquam horremus . . . ?*' *spectabit* 'will he look on', *sc.* unconcerned (as at Lucr. 2.1-2 *suae, mari magno turbantibus aequora uentis | e terra magnum alterius Spectare laborem* and examples below): Jupiter looks on in Epicurean detachment, but it will be the Epicurean Cassius who strikes Caesar down. *spectabit* is placed first for emphasis and perhaps further suggests Jupiter as a spectator of entertainment (*OLD* 3). The opposing

modes of viewing Pharsalus modelled by the narrator and his Jupiter – those of anguished engagement and apathy – are anticipated by Cato at 2.289–90 ‘*sidera quis mundumque uelit spectare cadentem | expers ipse metus?*’ (cf. also 4.400–1 *proelia soli | felices nullo spectant ciuilia uoto*). For active or inert divine spectatorship cf. Sen. *De otio* 4.2 *qui sit deus; deses opus suum spectet an tractet*; see Leigh 1997a: 94–5, 234–91. *ab alto | aethere*: cf. Virg. *A.* 12.140–1 *rex aetheris altus . . . | Iuppiter*; the detail further calls to mind Sulla’s serene gaze at 2.207–8 *intrepidus tanti sedit securus ab alto | spectator sceleris. Thessalicas . . . caedes*: cf. 6.62 *Thessalicae clades Libycaeque. teneat cum fulmina*: concessive.

**449 scilicet** ‘no doubt, then, . . .’, drawing attention to the absurdity of the question (*OLD* 4) which will emerge in 451 and rests on the notion that Jupiter showers lightning on mountains at random but does not strike down the guilty Caesar: cf. Lucr. 2.1101–3 *in deserta recedens | saeuia exercens telum, quod saepe nocentes | praeterit exanimatque indignos inque merentes?* **ipse**: in contrast to 451 *Cassius*. **Pholoen**: Lucan puts Mount Pholoe in Thessaly (6.391); elsewhere it is Arcadian (e.g. Strabo 8.32; Plin. *Nat.* 4.21). **Oeten**: in southern Thessaly (Barrington 55C3).

**450 immeritaeque nemus Rhodopes**: a double allusion to Lucr. 2.1103 *inque merentes* (quoted at 449n.) and Virg. *G.* 1.328–33 (*ipse pater . . . fulmina molitur | ille flagranti | aut Atho aut Rhodopen aut alta Ceraunia telo | deicit*). Rhodope was in western Thrace, but counted by Lucan as Thessalian at 6.618. **Mimantis**: a mountain in Ionia (and the name of one of the giants). *Mimantis* is the clever conjecture of Parrhasius (for *minantis* **Z**\***PGV** *manantes* **U** *manus* **ZM**). Ov. *Met.* 2.222 groups Rhodope and Mimas in the same *sedes*.

**451 Cassius hoc potius feriet caput**: the sole reference in the poem to Cassius Longinus, who took a leading role in the assassination of Caesar and who appears, in some sources, as its original instigator (Plut. *Brut.* 8.5–10.7; App. *BCiv.* 2.113.470–3; Suet. *Jul.* 80.4).

**451–2 astra Thyestae | intulit et subitis damnauit noctibus Argos**: cf. 1.543–4 *fugiente per ortus | sole Thyestae noctem duxere Mycenae. Thyestae* is the indirect object of *intulit* ‘inflicted’ (cf. 454 *Thessaliae*); *subitis . . . noctibus* is ablative with *damnauit* ‘doomed to’ (cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.335 *aeterna damnauit lumina nocte*); *Argos* is neuter accusative; it stands here for the district, including Mycenae (Postgate; at 10.60 it stands for all of Greece). The feud between Atreus and Thyestes was a powerful symbol of civil war (cf. e.g. Sen. *Thy.* 562). These two clauses give theme and variation on the moment when Zeus reversed the course of the sun in disapproval of their conflict. In earlier versions this was a response to Thyestes’ theft of the Golden Fleece, assisted by his adultery with Aerope (e.g. Eur. *El.* 727–36).



It was subsequently made a reaction to Thyestes' unwitting consumption of his children, as at Sen. *Thy.* 789–884. *astra Thyestae* | *intulit* may 'correct' a detail in Seneca: cf. 824–5 *non succedunt* | *astra nec ullo micat igne polus*.

**453–4 tot † similes † fratrum gladios patrumque gerenti | Thessaliae dabit ille diem?** The contrast between Mycenae and Thessaly is tightened by the chiasmus *astra Thyestae* . . . *Thessaliae* . . . *diem*. Clear skies over Pharsalus disprove Jupiter's intervention at Mycenae, since the Roman battle was a worse transgression in terms of the number of brothers involved and the addition of fathers (*Comm. Bern. ad* 451). The battle is recast as a personified Thessaly, herself bearing arms. Shackleton Bailey (*ad loc.* and 1987: 86) obelized *similes* because swords were not involved in the horrors at Argos and, more importantly, because it weakens the force of *fratrum* . . . *patrumque* ('almost ludicrously unnecessary'); he provisionally suggested *tot fratrum gladios iuuenumque patrumque* (with *iuuenum* 'sons' in contrast with *patrum*; for this sense see *TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.736.26–30).

**454–5 mortalia nulli | sunt curata deo** 'human affairs are the concern of no god'; cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 8.35 *nec curare deum credis mortalia quemquam*. The echo of 2.13 *habet mortalia casus* suggests a resolution to the dilemma expressed at 2.7–13 as to whether the universe is governed by Stoic or Epicurean principles. The sententious expression and its links to 445–6 (*mortalia* corresponds to *nobis* and *nulli deo* corresponds to *nulla numina*) hint at ring composition and create a false sense of closure to the section.

**455–6 cladis tamen huius habemus | uindictam:** the divine apathy of 447–55 is now treated as an active offence meriting retribution (*OLD uindicta* 2). *uindictam*, the subject of the new topic, gains emphasis as an enjambed molossus before a sense pause. The *crimina* of the gods, their culpability and the notion of humanity enacting vengeance upon them form a prominent theme in the poem. At 4.808–9 the gods are claimed to exact vengeance (*uindicta*) on behalf of Rome against men like Curio rather than protect Rome's liberty from them. At 2.92–3, Marius and Carthage 'forgive the gods' (*ignouere deis*); at 9.1103 Caesar claims that he could have helped Pompey forgive the gods; at 9.144–5 Gnaeus Magnus forgives the gods for abuses committed against Pompey's body (*superis haec crimina dono*). Actions on earth are frequently called the gods' *crimina*: at 2.288 Cato incurring guilt by joining the war will be a *crimen* . . . *superis*; at 5.59 Ptolemy is a *pudor crimenque deorum*; at 8.55 the defeated Pompey appears to Cornelia as a *crimen* . . . *deum crudele*; at 8.800 Pompey's tomb is a *crimen deum*.



**456 quantam terris dare numina fas est** ‘as much as gods are permitted to pay to mortals’; *terris* stands for *hominibus* by metonymy (cf. *OLD* 10 ‘the earth as the abode of mortals (contrasted with heaven as the abode of deities)’).

**457 bella pares superis facient ciuilia diuos:** the means of humanity’s vengeance is revealed in a tightly arranged paradox, to be developed in the following lines; the arrangement is all but a golden line (8n.; treating *pares superis* as one modifier). The paradox is assisted by the fact that *diuos* and *superus* are regularly synonyms and the line may hint at the prospect of theomachy as vengeance; i.e. ‘will make gods well matched against gods’ (*OLD par*<sup>1</sup> 13a; for *par* as a key thematic term of conflict in *BC* see Ahl 1976: 86–8; Hardie 1993: 19–56; Leigh 1997a: 235–6, 244). *manes* and *umbrae* in the following lines will clarify that *diuos* is in a lower category from *superi*; from the Augustan period it describes deified Roman emperors (*OLD* 1c); note particularly the cult title of Divus Iulius.

**458 fulminibus manes radiisque ornabit et astris:** the iconography of imperial apotheosis. Deified emperors were regularly depicted holding the thunderbolt (e.g. the bronze Augustus at Herculaneum, see Pollini 2012: 90–1, fig. II 24). *radiis* refers to the *corona radiata*, the radiate crown of *sol*; from 64 on Nero was the first living emperor to be depicted with it (Griffin 1984: 218). *astris* may be delayed for emphasis, since it evokes Caesar: the *sidus Iulium* of 44 was taken to indicate his apotheosis, Octavian added an image of the star to the head of Caesar’s statues, and it became part of his own posthumous iconography (Weinstock 1971: 370–84, Zanker 1988: 34–6). A Tiberian as shows the deified Augustus with all three symbols (*RIC*s.v. ‘Tiberius’ 72 = *BMCRE*s.v. ‘Tiberius’ 151).

**459 inque deum templis:** *deum* (genitive plural) is unnecessary for sense, but sharpens the point of the *sententia* and provides the most pointed contrast with *umbras* (restating 457 *superis* . . . *diuos*). **iurabit Roma per umbras:** cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.16 (to Augustus) *iurandasque tuum per numen ponimus aras* and esp. 9.601–2 (Cato) *dignissimus aris, | Roma, tuis, per quem numquam iurare pudebit. umbras* ‘ghosts’ is the nadir of the sequence *diuos* – *manes* – *umbras*; in *BC* it frequently denotes empty forms (*OLD* 9; e.g. 1.135 *magni nominis umbra*); for the idea cf. 6.809 (Erictho to Sextus and Pompey’s family) ‘*Romanorum manes calcate deorum*’.

#### 460–505 THE BATTLE BEGINS

**460–1 ut rapido cursu fati suprema morantem | consumpsere locum:** the narrative resumes from 385 *pari procurrunt agmina motu. fati suprema* ‘destiny’s critical moment’ (*OLD supremus* 6), *consumpsere* ‘reduced’ (*OLD* 1c).

**461** *parua tellure dirempti*: an echo of their last close encounter at 5.470 *duces parua campi statione diremptos*; in each case, proximity of the armies leads to recognition of kindred faces (5.471–4, 7.464–5; cf. 4.169–74).

**463–2** The majority of MSS give these lines in the order printed here, in which they give much better sense (**ΠA**\***PGV** Lactantius Placidus *ad Stat. Theb.* 6.760); a weaker tradition (**ZM** and corrected **U**) gives them in inverse order. **quo sua pila cadant aut quae sibi fata minentur | inde manus, spectant** ‘they look to see where their javelins will fall or whose hands on the other side threaten them with death’. This edition prints Håkanson’s conjecture *quae . . . manus (quam ΠΩ, qua U; manum ΠPGVC, manus ZU)*; *fata* is likelier as the object of *minentur* in the sense ‘death’ (*OLD* 6a, favoured by Lucan: *TLL* vi.359.80–360.4) than as its subject in the sense ‘fate’: cf. 9.615 *fatum dente minantur*, 3.36, 6.112. 462 *manus* could easily be corrupted and incorrectly reconstituted by the *s* following in *spectant* (Håkanson 1979: 44).

**462–6** Cf. 4.169–72 *postquam spatio languentia nullo | mutua conspicuos habuerunt lumina uultus, | . . . | deprensum est ciuile nefas*, 5.470–2 *posse duces parua campi statione diremptos | admotum damnare nefas; nam cernere uultus | et uoces audire datur*.

**462–4** **penitus quo noscere possent | facturi quae monstra forent** ‘so that they might profoundly recognize what monstrous acts they were about to commit’; a purpose clause introduced by *quo* (*OLD* 3) and containing an indirect question as the object clause of *noscere*; *forent* is the equivalent of *essent* (A–G §170 (a)). *penitus quo noscere possent*: the textual tradition of these words is unusually complicated and the variants go back to antiquity. It may be clearest to set out all variants here. (i) *penitus* is the conjecture of Håkanson (1979: 45), *tempus ΩC* (also in Lactantius Placidus, who quotes this line in his comment on *Stat. Theb.* 6.760), *uultus ΠZ<sup>2</sup>U*. (ii) *quo noscere possent Ω* (also in Lactantius Placidus), *quo no-* (with the remainder missing) **Π**, *que agnoscere quaerent Z<sup>2</sup>U*; the lemma of *Comm. Bern* reads ‘*tempusque t. i. r. n. p.*’ It is doubtful that *tempus* by itself can mean *tempus erat* (as *Comm. Bern.* states; Housman 1921: 172). Fraenkel (1926: 515) suggested that two half-lines had been lost after *spectant*, which would contextualize *tempus* (as an example he offered <*di concessere benigni | extremum miseris*> *tempus*, ‘benevolent gods granted to the wretched men a final moment . . .’); this would be a very unlikely phenomenon in the manuscript tradition of Lucan. In the main tradition, the choice is between *uultusque agnoscere quaerunt* and *tempus quo noscere possunt*; **Π**, a fourth- or fifth-century palimpsest, gives *uultus quo no-* (with the rest of the last word missing). The weight of authority endorses *tempus quo noscere possunt*, which requires emendation to make it intelligible. Håkanson’s *penitus* is

a comprehensible corruption through metathesis. Housman (1921) on the other hand favoured *uultus ΠΖ²U* and at 463 emended *parentes* to *parentum*: 'they see the faces of their parents'.

**464-5 uidere parentes | frontibus aduersis fraternaue comminus arma:** they see their parents and brothers face to face and do not flee. *frontibus aduersis* evokes *aduersae cicatrices*, honorable scars on the chest received by those who have not fled battle. *frontibus aduersis* and *comminus* are pathetic details that foreshadow the battle itself, since they more typically describe the manner of an enemy charge or face-to-face fighting (e.g. Liv. 22.47.2; Mart. 4.35.1; Ov. *Met.* 5.89, 12.595).

**466 nec libuit mutare locum:** cf. 181-3 (the Pompeians) *uoti turba nefandi | conscia, quae patrum iugulos, quae pectora fratrum | sperabat*, 1.376-8 (Laelius) '*pectore si fratris gladium iuguloque parentis | condere me iubeas . . . peragam*'.

**466-9** This moment's hesitation before *nefas* is typical of Caesar's soldiers: at 1.353-6 they are unresponsive because of *pietas* and the ancestral gods, but are recalled to action through fear of Caesar; at 3.429-35 they pause at the majesty of the grove (3.432 *implicitas magno . . . torpore cohortes*) before Caesar fells the first oak.

**466-7 tamen omnia torpor | pectora constrinxit:** *torpor* 'numbness, paralysis' (Ov. *Pont.* 1.2.28 *similis morti pectora torpor habet*). *constrinxit* may evoke medical terminology (TLL IV.545.70-4: *Physiogn.* 12 p. 21.1 *sanguis . . . sensus . . . et intellectus humani acumen constringit et hebetat atque intercipit*).

**467-8 gelidusque in uiscera sanguis | percussa pietate coit:** these terms more commonly describe a physiological reaction to fear: Virg. *A.* 3.30 *gelidusque coit formidine sanguis*, 12.905 with Tarrant; 339-40n. *percussa pietate* (ablative absolute) unusually transfers the verb from the men to their emotion; contrast e.g. 1.487 *uulgus inani percussum terrore* (TLL X<sup>1</sup>.1246.31-57).

**468-9 totaeque cohortes | pila parata diu tensis tenuere lacertis:** *diu* and *tensis* contribute to the uncanny image of massed ranks frozen on the point of action. *tensis* . . . *lacertis* is ablative of manner; not 'arms outstretched' (Braund), but with muscles taut and ready to throw. Weapons, esp. javelins, are typically described as being cast by the *lacerti*, as at 1.364 *dum pila ualent fortes torquere lacerti*, 2.261-2 (OLD 1C).

**470-5** Crastinus, an *euocatus* who had in 49 been *primus pilus* of the 10th legion, is twice singled out in Caesar's account of the battle. At *Civ.* 3.91.1 he is given two brief direct speeches in which he exhorts the army and promises Caesar his own bravery. He is the first Caesarian to charge after

the signal has been given (which Lucan describes at 477). At 3.99.2-3 he is noted among the dead, praised for his bravery and his service. In Livy's account he was the first person to strike an enemy in the battle (472n.). On Crastinus in *BC*: Lounsbury 1975; Leigh 1997a: 140-2, 215-16.

**470-1** Cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.91.3 (Crastinus) '*faciam*' inquit '*hodie, imperator, ut aut uiuo mihi aut mortuo gratias agas*'. **di tibi non mortem . . . | sed sensum post fata . . . dent . . . morti:** for Epicurus, death entailed a στέρησις αἰσθήσεως 'deprivation of sensation' (Diog. Laert. 10.124); that there is no post-mortem sensation was a fundamental tenet of Epicureanism (cf. Lucr. 3.838-41 *sic, ubi non erimus, cum corporis atque animai | discidium fuerit, quibus e sumus uniter apti, | scilicet haud nobis quicquam, qui non erimus tum, | accidere omnino poterit sensumque mouere* with Kenney). The doctrine had offered comfort to Pompey at 3.39-40 '*aut nihil est sensus animis a morte relictum | aut mors ipsa nihil*' (see Earnshaw 2013).

**470 quae cunctis poena paratur:** *poena* is frequently used of death when describing it as a universal condition of man; cf. 8.395 (Lentulus) '*mors ultima poena est*' (*TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.2503.58-63).

**471 tuae . . . morti:** i.e. *tibi mortuo*, his dead body (*OLD mors* 5a; *TLL* VIII.1504.41-70).

**472 cuius torta manu commisit lancea bellum** 'by whose hand was hurled the spear that began the battle' (*OLD committo* 8b); cf. Liv. frag. 42 *primus hostem percussit nuper pilo sumpto primo C. Crastinus*. For attention in epic to the first spear or weapon cast in a battle cf. Virg. *A.* 9.52-3 (Turnus) *principium pugnae*; the closer models for Crastinus are the truce-violators Pandarus (Hom. *Il.* 4.104-40) and Tolumnius (Virg. *A.* 12.258-68).

**473 primaque Thessaliam Romano sanguine tinxit:** cf. Petr. 124.294 (*Discordia*) '*Thessalicosque sinus humano sanguine tingue*'.

**474 o praeceps rabies!** The battle frenzy of Crastinus is stressed at App. *BCiv.* 2.82.347 (καθάρπερ ἐνθουν 'just as if possessed'); Plut. *Pomp.* 71.1-3, Caes. 44.11-12; cf. also *Comm. Bern. ad 470 ut historia refert, adacto in os gladio, sic inter cadauera repertus est, libidinem ac rabiem qua pugnauerat ipsa nouitate uulneris praeferebat*; the source referred to will be either Livy or Pollio, the latter perhaps more likely since the scholiast turns from this information to quote Livy explicitly (*de quo Titus Liuius dicit . . .* = frag. 42; 472n.). For *praeceps* as a characteristic description of the Caesarians in *BC* see 334-6n.

**474-5 cum Caesar tela teneret, | inuenta est prior ulla manus?** 'While Caesar was holding weapons, was a hand found to act before his?' *prior* 'in anticipation or advance of' (*OLD* 4b).

**475–84:** Cf. Allecto's signal, heard throughout Italy at Virg. *A.* 7.511–18; also Hom. *Il.* 21.387–8 σὺν δ' ἔπρεσον μεγάλῳ πατάγῳ, βράχῃ δ' εὐρεῖα χθών, | ἄμφι δὲ σάλπιγξεν μέγας οὐρανός 'together then they clashed with a mighty din and the wide earth rang, and round about great heaven pealed as with a trumpet'. In his ode to Asinius Pollio, Horace lays emphasis upon the signal for battle: *Carm.* 2.1.17–18 *iam nunc minaci murmure cornuum | perstringis auris, iam litui strepunt.*

**475–7** form a link to the first strategic move of the war, the capture of Ariminum: cf. 1.237–8 *stridor lituum clangorque tubarum | non pia concinuit cum rauco classica cornu.*

**475–6** Cf. Sen. *Oed.* 732–4 (Theban portents) *sonuit reflexo classicum cornu | lituusque . . . stridulos cantus | elisit.* **tum stridulus aer | elisus lituis:** the sound of the *lituus* is often described as *stridulus* (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.1542.7–10); *elisus* 'emitted' (*OLD* 3b).

**476 conceptaque classica cornu** 'the call to arms produced in the trumpet' (*OLD* *concupio* 4a); heavy alliteration of *c* (and *g*) assists, as at 1.238 (quoted at 475–7n.).

**477 tunc ausae dare signa tubae:** *ausae* is transferred from the trumpeters to their instruments; *ausae* may hint at a reluctance to give the signal (cf. 466–g), overcome by the example of the other instruments.

**477–8 tunc aethera tendit | extremique fragor conuexa irrumpit Olympi:** cf. 1.388 *it tantus ad aethera clamor*; *aethera* is accusative of motion without a preposition. This is an extravagant development of a common hyperbole (cf. Virg. *A.* 12.409 with Tarrant; Hardie 1986: 241–92); cf. Enn. *Ann.* 554 *contremuit templum magnum Iouis altitonantis*. The framing hyperbaton *extremique . . . Olympi* adds emphasis. *irrumpit* suggests a military assault.

**479** An allusion to Lucr. 3.18–22, which adapts Homer's description of Olympus at *Od.* 6.42–6 to illustrate the gods' life of sublime detachment. **unde procul nubes:** cf. Hom. *Od.* 6.44–5 αἴθρη | . . . ἀννέφελος 'cloudless ether'; Lucr. 3.19–22 (*sedes*) *quas . . . nec nubila nimbis | aspergunt . . . semperque innubilis aether | integit.* **quo nulla tonitrua durant** 'where no thunder reaches' (*OLD* *duro* 8 'to continue, go on').

**480–4** The war-cry re-echoes around the mountains of Thessaly. Haemus and Pangaea, both in Thrace, are included by the poetic conceit that the battles of Philippi and Pharsalus were fought in the same place: cf. 1.679–80 (the *matrona*) '*uideo Pangaea niuiosis | cana iugis latosque Haemi sub rupe Philippos*' with Roche on 1.680.

**480 Haemus:** in northern Thrace (Barrington 22C6).

**481 Peliacisque . . . cauernis:** Mt Pelion on the eastern border of Thessaly, on the Magnesian Peninsula (Barrington 55E2). **dedit rursus geminare:** infinitive of purpose, a poeticism; not uncommon with *dare*; cf. Virg. A. 1.319 *dederatque comam diffundere uentis* (NLS §28; examples at TLL v<sup>1</sup>.1688.59–80). *dedit rursus* implies that the sound went first from Haemus to Pelion; cf. 9.173 (of renewed grief) *rursus geminato uerbere plangunt*.

**482 Pindus:** to the west of Thessaly, running north to south (Barrington 55A2). **agit gemitus:** cf. Virg. A. 6.872–3 (Anchises) ‘*quantos ille uirum magnam Mauortis ad urbem | campus aget gemitus!*’ **Pangaeaue saxa:** a mountain range in Macedonia on the north Aegean coast (Barrington 51C3). **resultant** ‘give off an echo’ (OLD 3b); cf. Virg. A. 5.150 *pulsati colles clamore resultant*.

**483 Oetaeaeque . . . rupes:** see 449n. **gemunt** suggests an emotive response from the landscape (pathetic fallacy).

**483–4 uocesque furoris | expauere sui tota tellure relatas:** the soldiers are the subject of the verb; cf. 273–4 (Caesar on the Pompeian *barbaries*) ‘*non agmine moto | clamorem latura suum*’.

**485–88** Lucan omits the failed Pompeian stratagem of awaiting the Caesarian charge from their position (Caes. Civ. 3.92.1). These lines correspond to Caesar’s narrative at 3.93.1–2 (the Caesarians) *renouato cursu pila miserunt . . .* (the Pompeians) *tela missa exceperunt . . . pilisque missis ad gladios redierunt*.

**485 spargitur innumerum diuersis missile uotis:** the surprise word *uotis* is delayed until last place, to be explained in the following lines. For *spargere* applied to javelins and similar weapons (OLD 2a) cf. Enn. Ann. 281 *hastati spargunt hastas, fit ferreus imber*. *missile* (collective singular) for *telum* or *pilum* is as early as the Elder Cato (*hist. fr.* 76 *omnes . . . perfossi gladiis aut missilibus aperti cadunt*).

**486–7 uulnera pars optat, pars terrae figere tela | ac puras seruare manus:** the image of the spear in the ground is a common detail in narrating a missed throw in Homer (as at e.g. *Il.* 16.611–12 τὸ δ’ ἑξόπιθεν δόρυ μακρὸν | οὕδ’ ἐνισκίμθη ‘and the long spear fixed itself in the ground behind him’). For *puras* . . . *manus* cf. 263 (n.) (Caesar) ‘*nulla manus, belli mutato iudice, pura est*’.

**487–8 rapit omnia casus | atque incerta facit quos uult Fortuna nocentes:** this *sententia* allows Lucan to avoid the traditional epic device of narrating the god’s response to human prayer (cf. e.g. Virg. A. 11.794–8). *rapit omnia casus*: cf. Sal. Cat. 8.1 *sed profecto fortuna in omni re dominatur*;

*ea res cunctas ex lubricidine magis quam ex uero celebrat obscuratque.* Her unpredictability is one of a number of regular characteristics attributed to *Fortuna*: Plin. *Nat.* 2.22 *Fortuna . . . a plerisque uero et caeca existimata, uaga, inconstans, incerta, uaria indignorumque faultrix.* To be made guilty by participation in the war is an obsession of the poem and its characters: 2.259 (Brutus), 2.288 (Cato), 7.260 (Caesar), 8.137 (Pompey).

**514–20 PMGV** have lines 489–520 in the order of the margin numbers; **U** has the order 510–20, 489–509. Postgate and Housman each adopted the order 514–20, 489–513, which is printed in this edition. Lines 485–8 and 514–20 are closely connected since they contrast the heavy guilt of Romans fighting Romans with the crime-free intervention of foreign auxiliaries. At 514 *tunc* et ‘then also (the Itryaeans . . .)’ refers logically to the Roman conflict at 485–8. Lines 510–20 do not make sense together: each race casts its weapons at 510–13 and then the Itryaei, Medes and Arabs are introduced at 514 to cast their weapons as though they are a separate group. No satisfactory connection exists between 488 and 510–13 (the order in **U**): *illic* has nothing to which it can refer after 488, but it makes good sense after 507–9 (*per ultima . . . per extremos . . . maniplos*); nor does 521 *cum Caesar . . .* make sense following 514–20. Copyists clearly brought together the two originally separate references to light-armed auxiliaries at 514–20 and 510–13. Housman theorized that 514–20 were moved forward to follow 510–13 and that subsequently both references were moved back en bloc to follow 488, the order preserved in **U**.

**514 Itryaei**: see 230n. **Arabesque soluti**: *soluti* ‘in loose formation’ (*OLD* 3a). It seems unlikely to mean ‘loose-clothed’ (Braund) without further elaboration: contrast 8.367–8 (Lentulus to Pompey) ‘*illic et laxas uestes et fluxa uirorum | uelamenta uidēs*’.

**515 arcu turba minax**: perhaps a pejorative swipe at the corporate bravery of a foreign group indiscriminately firing long-range weapons. **nusquam rexere** ‘aimed in no specific direction’.

**516 qui campis imminet aer** ‘the air that hangs over the battlefield’ is unlikely to mean the lower air specifically (as at Ov. *Met.* 1.52 (of the zones of the earth) *imminet his aer*): cf. *aether* at 519 in the same general sense.

**517 mortes**: a vivid metonymy for the means of death: cf. Sen. *Contr.* 7.3.8 (of poison) *mortem . . . meam effudit* (*OLD mors* 4b).

**517–18 sceleris sed crimine nullo | externum maculant chalybem**: *crimen* ‘reproach’ (*OLD* 2a); *sceleris* is placed first for emphasis. *externum . . . chalybem* (underscored by the exotic word *chalybs*) carries the point of the sentence: they incur no guilt as foreigners; cf. 519 *pila*. The Chalybes, a



people of Asia Minor, were sometimes credited with the invention of iron (as at Callim. *Aet. frag.* 110.48–50); the metonym *chalybs* for *ferrum* is as early as Virg. *A.* 8.446; the second step, *chalybs* for *ferrum* used of an iron weapon, is Senecan (e.g. *Thy.* 364).

**518–19 stetit omne coactum | . . . nefas:** *coactum* ‘concentrated’ calls to mind the poem’s attention to constricted spaces (221–2n.); it also suggests ‘stood assembled’, as though the *nefas* were itself soldiers within the army (cf. Caes. *Gal.* 5.22.1 *coactis omnibus copiis*).

**519 circa pila:** as used by the Roman legionaries: cf. 1.7 *pila minantia pilis*.

**519–20 ferro subtexitur aether | noxque super campos telis conserta pependit:** theme and variation. *ferro subtexitur aether:* a *nimbus telorum*, as at 4.776 with Esposito (cf. Tarrant on Virg. *A.* 12.284 *tempestas telorum*). *subtexitur* ‘is screened in darkness’; prior to Lucan it is used almost exclusively of clouds; cf. Lucr. 5.466; Virg. *A.* 3.582 (Trinacria) *caelum subtexere fumo*. *noxque super campos telis conserta pependit:* *conserere* ‘to make by joining’ evokes chain mail, as at Virg. *A.* 3.467. Lucan’s arresting image of densely cast weapons creating a ‘night’ compresses a venerable hyperbole: cf. Hdt. 7.266; Plut. *Mor.* 225B; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.101; Val. Max. 3 ext. 8.

**489 quota** ‘how small!’ (*OLD* 1b). **iaculis ferroque uolanti:** both nouns refer to 519 *pila* (Dilke).

**490 exacta est** ‘was completed’ (*OLD* 5a); coupled with *quota pars* it suggests a mercantile metaphor ‘made up the total’ (*OLD* 5b).

**490–1 odiis solus ciuilibus ensis | sufficit, et dextras Romana in uiscera ducit:** Roman historians commonly observed that the fiercest fighting often came when the *pila* had been cast and fighting with swords began: see Oakley on Liv. 6.12.8. *odiis solus ciuilibus ensis:* interlaced word order enhances the unique match of instrument and emotion. *odiis . . . ciuilibus* is only here in this sense; the collocation pre-existed in the sense ‘patriotic, public-spirited’ (Cic. *Mil.* 35 *hoc ciuile odium, quo omnis improbos odimus*). For *ensis* see 287–8n. *sufficit* ‘is adequate’ (*OLD* 7a). *dextras Romana in uiscera ducit:* cf. 1.7 (*populum*) *in sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra. ducit* suggests an autonomous sword.

**492–4** These details ominously recall the final stand of Curio’s army at 4.781–2 *non arma mouendi | iam locus est pressis, stipataque membra teruntur*; cf. also the Tartessii defeated by Hasdrubal in 216 at Liv. 23.27.6–7 *cum paucitas parum tuta esset, respicere alii alios et undique pulsati coire in orbem, et*



*dum <corpora> corporibus applicant armaque armis iungunt, in artum compulsi, cum uix mouendis armis satis spatii esset, corona hostium cincti ad multum diei caeduntur.*

**492–3 Pompei densis acies stipata cateruis | iunxerat in seriem nexis umbonibus arma** ‘Pompey’s army, crowded with closely packed squadrons, had joined its weapons to form a continuous line with shields held together’. *umbonibus* ‘shields’ by synecdoche (cf. Virg. *A.* 7.632–3 *flectuntque salignas | umbonum cratis*); they are joined to withstand the charge, to defend against blows and to drive the enemy back (e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 4.51.6 *pellere umbonibus*).

**494–5 uixque habitura locum dextras ac tela mouendi | constiterat:** see 492–4n.; cf. Virg. *A.* 10.432–3 *extremi addensent acies nec turba moueri | tela manusque sinist.*

**495 gladiosque suos compressa timebat:** cf. Curio’s army at 4.779 *uix impune suos inter conuertitur enses* ‘he can hardly turn uninjured among his own army’s swords’.

**496 praecipiti cursu:** three times in this *sedes* in *BC*, and always of Caesar or his forces (334–6n.). **uesanum** can, like *insanus*, *furiosus* or *amens*, denote a passion which is destructive to the state or over-eagerness for battle: cf. Sil. 8.310–11 (Fabius) ‘*quantos, insane, ciebis | Varro uiros, tu (pro superi!) tam pronus in arma!*’ (see Opelt 1965: 142). In epic, the passions required for battle are regularly described as madness: cf. Virg. *A.* 7.460–2 *arma amens fremit, arma toro tectisque requirit; | saeuit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli, | ira super* (cf. 2.314–17).

**497 in densos agitur cuneos** ‘charges against the closely packed formations’; military vocabulary (Gell. 10.9.1); cf. Virg. *A.* 12.457–8 *densi cuneis se quisque coactis | agglomerant*.

**497–8 perque arma, per hostem | quaerit iter:** the expression *quaerere iter* elsewhere describes the flow of rivers (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.541.48–51), a common point of comparison for the hero’s movement in battle (e.g. Virg. *A.* 12.523–5). Anaphora of *per* is not uncommon (*TLL* X<sup>1</sup>.1167.31–52); here it strikes an intensifying note, underlining the manic nature of the Caesarian charge.

**498 qua:** correlative with 500 *hac*.

**498–9 torta graues lorica catenas | opponit:** *torta* . . . *lorica* ‘chain mail’; *catenas*: the ‘chain’ of interconnected rings. Vegetius (1.20.8) records that the infantry found the *lorica* heavy (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.64 *corpora grauiora loriceis*).

**499 tutoque . . . sub tegmine** ‘beneath armour that offers safety’. *tuto* is proleptic (it anticipates the function of *tegmine*); cf. Virg. A. 7.632 *tegmina tuta cauant capitem* (with Horsfall).

**500 hac quoque** ‘even here’ (*OLD quoque* 4a). **uiscera** ‘guts’; × 43 in *BC* (cf. 309–10n.).

**500–1 totque per arma | extremum est quod quisque ferit** ‘and through so much armour it is a deadly wound that each man strikes’: *extremum* ‘deadly, death-bringing’ (*TLL* v<sup>2</sup>.2003.22–9) also suggests the depth of the thrust.

**501–2 ciuilia bella | una acies patitur, gerit altera:** a sententious paradox, sharpened by chiasmus of subjects (*una acies . . . altera [acies]*) and verbs. The contrast of armies either enduring or waging war matches the contrasting propensities of Pompey and Caesar towards inertia or activity in the poem; the same correlation continues at 502–3 in the description of active and inactive swords (cf. Rosner-Siegal 1983: 171–7 for other examples).

**502–3 frigidus inde | . . . gladius:** cf. 5.245 *frigidus ensis*. The adjective gains some emphasis after a strong sense pause at the bucolic diaeresis.

**503 a Caesare** ‘on Caesar’s side’ (*OLD ab* 24a), balancing *inde*. For the weapon warmed by blood (also at 4.511) cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.333 (= 20.476) πάν δ’ ὑπερέρμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι ‘and all the blade grew warm with blood’; Virg. A. 10.486 *rapit calidum . . . de corpore telum*.

**504–5 nec Fortuna diu rerum tot pondera uergens | abstulit ingentes fato torrente ruinas** ‘Fortune, not long (merely) inclining the balance of so many issues, swept away the mighty ruins in the torrent of fate.’ *nec* negates only *diu*. *Fortuna*, already inclining the scales against the republicans (*rerum . . . pondera uergens*: the loser’s weight sinks down), does not long sustain even the notion of a contest of two possible outcomes; she soon makes clear the impossibility of any outcome apart from total republican defeat: cf. 3.752–3 *inclinant iam fata ducum, nec iam amplius anceps | belli casus erat*. The metaphors are mixed (Heitland 1887: lxxxix provides further examples): in 504 the image is of scales; in 505, a river in spate seeping away architectural debris (*OLD ruina* 4a). These images appear in metaphors elsewhere in *BC* (for the scales cf. e.g. 3.337–8 (the Massiliotes) ‘*non pondera rerum | nec momenta sumus*’, 8.280 (Pompey) ‘*mentisque meae quo pondera uergant*’; for the flooding river cf. e.g. 4.817–18 (of Curio) *ambitus et luxus et opum metuenda facultas | transuerso mentem dubiam torrente tulerunt*; for architectural ruination cf. e.g. 1.24–6, 1.71 *nimioque graues sub pondere lapsus*). For the scales at the moment of crisis in epic cf. Hom. *Il.* 22.209–13 ‘. . . then it was that the father lifted up

his golden scales and set in them two fates of grievous death, one for Achilles, and one for horse-taming Hector; then he grasped the balance by the middle and raised it; and down sank the day of doom of Hector and went away to Hades' (trans. Murray, rev. Wyatt); Virg. A. 12.725–7 *Iuppiter ipse duas aequato examine lances | sustinet et fata imponit diuersa duorum, | quem damnet labor et quo uergat pondere letum*. The pairing *Fortuna* and *fata* is characteristic of the poem: 'Lucan uses language of destiny and randomness more or less interchangeably: *fatum/fata, fortuna/fors, dei/superi* are explanatory terms which jostle beside each other in every imaginable context . . . a term from either category is virtually never mentioned without a term from the other in very close proximity, as if to destabilize any assurance for reader or author' (Feeney 1991: 280); in book 7, cf. 88–9, 205–6, 646–7.

Although *pondera uertens* (Ω) has better authority, this edition prints *uergens* (ζ) on the strength of *uergat* at Virg. A. 12.727 (quoted above, this note) and because *uertens* does not give the sense required by the context. Housman paraphrased it *huc et illuc* . . . *pondera uertit* ('turns the balance here and there'), but this does not match the state of affairs in 501–3, where the fortunes of neither side are fluctuating; Housman further added that *uersans* or *uergens* might rather be expected.

## 506–544 THE POMPEIAN CAVALRY IS ROUTED

The routing of Pompey's cavalry was the key moment of the battle and the immediate cause of the republican defeat. Pompey's strategy was to attack Caesar's right wing on his open flank and surround his column from the rear; to achieve this he concentrated all of his cavalry and archers on his own left wing (Caes. *Civ.* 3.86.3, 3.88.6; Plut. *Caes.* 44.5). Caesar anticipated this plan and before the battle withdrew six cohorts from his third line to make an additional, fourth line opposite Pompey's cavalry (Caes. *Civ.* 3.89.4; Plut. *Caes.* 44.3, *Pomp.* 69.2–3). When Pompey's cavalry, archers and slingers attacked Caesar's right wing, they defeated Caesar's cavalry, as expected. However, as they were moving behind Caesar's army, the fourth line attacked and routed Pompey's cavalry. The archers and slingers were killed, and the fourth line now surrounded Pompey's exposed left wing. At this point Caesar's third line entered the battle and attacked Pompey's army from the front (Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.3–8; Plut. *Caes.* 45.1–6, *Pomp.* 71.4–6).

In Caesar's account, this turn of events is presented as resulting from his own planning and foresight: before the battle he is conscious of his cavalry's numerical inferiority and he works to build their experience (Caes. *Civ.* 3.84.3); he anticipates the threat to his right wing and prior

to the battle reminds the fourth line that victory will depend on their courage (3.89.4). After they surround Pompey's army, Caesar explicitly states that he was not wrong to think that victory would come from them (3.94.3). In Lucan's account, Caesar's foresight is present but marginalized. He fears for his front line (521–2) and launches cohorts he has kept behind the standards, but the reversal is plainly stated as resulting from the defective foreign courage of Pompey's cavalry (525–7). The ethnicity of Pompey's cavalry continues to dominate the passage in the narrator's wish that either foreign blood sate the fields at Pharsalus or, conversely, that the foreign contingents be spared because they will constitute the Roman people after Pharsalus.

**506–7 ut primum toto diduxit cornua campo | Pompeianus eques bellique per ultima fudit:** cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.3 *equites ab sinistro Pompei cornu, ut erat imperatum, uniuersi procucurrerunt, omnisque multitudo sagittariorum se profudit. ut primum* 'as soon as'. *toto diduxit cornua campo:* Lucan has Pompey's cavalry on both wings, as does Frontinus (*Strat.* 2.3.22). For confusion regarding the disposition of forces see 217–23n. *diduxit* 'deployed' (*OLD* 2c). *bellique per ultima fudit* 'spread them along the battle's edges'.

**508** Foot soldiers follow the charging cavalry. **leuis armatura** 'light-armed troops' (also called *uelites*: e.g. Liv. 30.33.3), the archers and slingers stationed with Pompey's cavalry.

**509 in hostem:** the Caesarians, *hostes* from the point of view of the Pompeian forces; cf. 523 *uagus hostis* of the Pompeians.

**510 illic:** among Pompey's light-armed troops (Housman; cf. 508). **suo** (emphatic) 'its own distinctive' (Braund; *OLD* 2a). **misceat . . . proelia** 'joins battle' (*OLD misceo* 13b).

**511 Romanus . . . cruor:** emotive, as at Liv. 30.28.5 (Hannibal's army) *perfusum miliens cruore Romano*; Sen. *Clem.* 1.11.1 *post mare Actiacum Romano cruore infectum*. **cunctis:** dative of agent. **petitur:** the simple form, in place of the compound *appetit* (*simplex pro composito*).

**511–12 inde . . . | inde:** both refer to the same place as 510 *illic*.

**512 faces et saxa uolant:** cf. Virg. *A.* 1.150 *iamque faces et saxa uolant*; *faces* are out of place on an open battlefield.

**512–13 spatioque solutae | aeris et calido liquefactae pondere glandes** 'and slingers' shot, melted by the distance, travelled through the air and liquefied by its own heated weight'; cf. Virg. *A.* 9.588–9 (Mezentius) *media aduersi liquefacto tempora plumbo | diffidit*. Lucan's version is preoccupied by the scientific causes of the phenomenon: for the belief that air friction can heat shot lead to melting point cf. Arist. *Cael.* 289a.21–6;

Lucr. 6.177–9, 6.306–8; Sen. *Nat.* 2.57.1 *liquescit excussa glans funda et attritu aeris uelut igne destillat*. Ovid twice used the image in similes: at *Met.* 2.726–9 (Mercury in flight and burning with desire for Herse) and 14.824–6 (the apotheosis of Romulus).

**513–521** Lines 514–20 are printed between 488–9 (see 514–20n.).

**521–4** It is difficult to reconcile the contradiction of the temporal clause *cum* . . . *tenet* . . . *cohortes* ('while he keeps his cohorts back') with the sentence *emittit* . . . *agmen* ('he sends forth a column'). Hudson-Williams 1959: 70–1 read *metuens* . . . *tenet* . . . *cohortes* as parenthetical and suggested that after 522 a line has dropped out in which the finite verb of the *cum* clause describes Caesar giving the signal to the cohorts (cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.5 *quartae aciei* . . . *dedit signum*).

**521–2 metuens ne frons sibi prima labaret | incursu:** cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.89.4 (Caesar, prior to battle) *timens ne a multitudine equitum dextrum cornu circumniretur. labaret* 'falter, waiver' (*OLD* 1c).

**522 tenet obliquas post signa cohortes:** cf. Front. *Strat.* 2.3.22 *sex deinde cohortes in subsidio retinuit ad res subitas et dextro latere conuersas in obliquum, unde equitatum hostium exspectabat, conlocauit*.

**523 inque latus belli:** i.e. the area around and behind Caesar's right wing. **qua se uagus hostis agebat:** *uagus* 'scattered, moving in different directions' suggests ill-discipline (cf. 10.436–8 *acies non sparsa manipulis | nec uaga . . . sed iustos qualis ad hostes | recta fronte uenit*). This detail and the epithet *hostis* suggest Caesar's subjective point of view; cf. 508n.

**524 emittit subitum . . . agmen:** cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.6 *illae celeriter procurrerunt. subitum:* adjective for adverb. **non motis cornibus** 'with his wings unmoved'; the Caesarian forces nearby did not join the *agmen* in attacking the Pompeian cavalry. The cavalry on Caesar's right wing had yielded (Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.4 *paulum loco motus cessit*).

**525 immemores pugnae** 'heedless of the fight'. **nulloque pudore timendi:** *timendi* is an objective genitive. *pudor* is itself a species of fear, of deserved censure (*timor iustae reprehensionis*, Gell. 19.6.3). On the battlefield it prevents flight (Liv. 6.24.7 *pudor primo tenuit effusos*, 39.49.2), retreat (Hirt. 8.28.4 *pudore cedendi* . . . *proeliantur*) or hanging back (Curt. 9.4.32); see *TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.2496.30–60; Kaster 2005: 28–65, esp. 47.

**526 praecipites:** i.e. *in fugiendo*.

**526–7 fecere palam ciuilia bella | non bene barbaricis umquam commissa cateruis:** a paradoxical *sententia*, underscored by assonance, rhyme and alliteration. *commissa* 'entrusted' (cf. Cic. *Man.* 50 *eidem* . . . *hoc quoque bellum* . . . *committamus?*). For the expression cf. Sen. *Ep.* 90. 34 *palam fecit*

*felicissimum esse cui felicitate non opus est.* For the notion of a well-known truth being ‘made open’ cf. Tac. *Hist.* 1.4.3 *euulgato imperii arcano posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri.* For *cateruis* see 337–8n.; cf. Sen. Ag. 600 *barbaricis equitum cateruis.*

**528–31** These lines are virtually explanatory of 525–7. Cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.6 *infestisque signis tanta ui in Pompei equites impetum fecerunt ut eorum nemo consisteret omnesque conuersi non solum loco excederent sed protinus incitati fuga montes altissimos peterent* (cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 71.4, Caes. 45.1–3).

**528 sonipes transfixus pectora ferro** ‘the charger, speared through the chest with iron weapons’. *pectora* (poetic plural): accusative of respect (NLS §19; cf. Liv. 21.7.10 *femur tragula* . . . *ictus* ‘struck in the thigh with a javelin’). According to Plutarch (*Pomp.* 69.3, 72.4, Caes. 45.2–3) the fourth line did not cast their javelins at the cavalry but struck up with them, aiming for the riders’ faces. The poetic *sonipes*, used only here of Pompey’s cavalry, contrasts with their panic and cowardly flight.

**529 in caput effusi calcauit membra regentis** ‘trampled on the limbs of its rider, thrown on to his head’. *effusi* . . . *regentis*: cf. Virg. A. 10.574 *effunduntque ducem* (with Harrison; *OLD* *effundo* 12).

**530 omnis eques cessit campis**: cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.6 (quoted at 528–31n.). **glomerataque nubes** ‘and as a concentrated mass’ (*OLD* *nubes* 5b); cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.274 *νέφος* . . . *πεζῶν* ‘a cloud of foot-soldiers’; Liv. 35.49.5 *peditum equitumque nubes.*

**531 in sua conuersis praeceps ruit agmina frenis**: Lucan adds this detail to the accounts in his sources: cf. 1.3 *in sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra.*

**532–3** Cf. Liv. 2.53.2 *intra uallum deinde caedes magis quam proelium esse*, 25.14.10 *caedes inde, non iam pugna erat*; Curt. 4.15.32 *iamque non pugna, sed caedes erat.*

**532 perdidit inde modum caedes** ‘then the slaughter lost all limit’ (*OLD* *perdo* 3a); cf. Liv. 9.25.8 (of Auruncian cities taken in the absence of leaders) *nullus modus caedibus fuit.*

**533 hinc iugulis, hinc ferro bella geruntur**: elsewhere in *BC* a swapping of the roles played by bodies and weapons denotes enthusiastic victims meeting their deathblow (e.g. 4.561 *percussum est pectore ferrum*, 6.160–1 (Scaeva) *confringite tela | pectoris impulsu iugulisque retundite ferrum*). Here the paradox of ‘battles waged by throats’ vivifies a one-sided slaughter. On the body in Lucan and the ‘automatizing’ effect of such enallage (the disruption or distortion of the normal syntactic relations of words) see Bartsch 1997: 23–9, 157 n. 41; Dinter 2012: 44–5.

**534–5** *nec ualet haec acies tantum prosternere quantum | inde perire potest* ‘this battle line does not have sufficient strength to cut down as many as are able to die on the other side’. *prosternere* ‘defeat utterly’ (*OLD* 5a; 278n.) often merges with the broader sense ‘kill’ (*TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.2228.13). The alliterative paradox *perire potest* enlivens the common historiographical motif that there are ‘too many to slaughter’ in a rout. For this motif cf. e.g. Liv. 6.8.7 with Kraus, who adduces *B. Afr.* 19.3 and these lines.

**535–43** The narrator wishes either that only barbarian blood be spilt (535–8) or, conversely, that the blood of foreigners be altogether spared, since henceforth they will constitute the *populus Romanus* (539–43).

**535–6** *utinam, Pharsalia, campis | sufficiat cruor iste tuis*: the present tense maintains the conceit that the battle’s outcome is still in doubt; cf. 415n. on *possunt* and 397–8n. on the narrator’s change of tense. *iste* ‘this’ is used without reference to the second person (*OLD* 4). This is the only direct apostrophe to the battle site in the poem. The notion that blood may not satisfy a personified Pharsalus suggests an offering made to a deity. In *BC* blood spilt in the civil wars is more typically presented as an offering to the shades of state enemies: cf. 1.9 *gentibus inuisis Latium praebere cruorem*, 4.788–90, 6.309–10; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 7.9–10, *Carm.* 2.1.25–8 (and see Ahl 1976: 84–112). For *cruor* see 292n.

**537** *non alio mutentur sanguine fontes*: *mutentur* ‘tinged’ (*OLD* 11), with perhaps a hint at transforming water into blood, continues the wish at 536; *alio*, i.e. *Romano*. For bloodied rivers see 116n.

**538** *hic numerus totos tibi uestiat ossibus agros* ‘would that this mob clothe all your fields in its bones’; *hic* is emphatic; *numerus* is pejorative (*OLD* 8b). This figurative use of *uestio* adapts its more regular application to fields covered in vegetation (*OLD* 2b), e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 4.707 *uestitos messibus agros*. Bones rather than bodies suggests a long passage of time, as at Virg. *G.* 1.493–7. Lucan will fully develop the theme of dead bodies covering the plains at 786–824.

**539** *aut, si Romano compleri sanguine mauis*: slow spondees give weight to the condition. For fields glutted with blood cf. Liv. 25.12.6 (Marcus predicting Cannae) ‘*neque credes tu mihi, donec compleris sanguine campum*’; 116n. *compleri* ‘(your appetite) to be satisfied’ (*OLD* 8a; *TLL* iii 2091.80–4).

**540** *istis parce, precor*: *istis*, i.e. non-Romans (echoing 536 *cruor iste*), a paradox to be developed in the following lines. *parce*, *precor*, a common pairing (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.1.2 with Thomas), here develops the suggestion of Pharsalus as a deity receiving an offering; the parenthetical *precor* adds urgency and emotion.



**540–2 uiuant Galataeque Syrique, | Cappadoces Gallique extremique orbis Hiberi | Armenii, Cilices:** the indignant enumeration of the many ethnic elements comprising Pompey's foreign forces is capped by the one *populus Romanus* at 543. For *-que . . . -que* see 30n. *Galataeque*: Caesar (*Civ.* 3.4.3) notes 600 'Gauls' (for this nomenclature see *NP* s.v. 'Galatia') in Pompey's cavalry, supplied by Deiotarus; they are not mentioned elsewhere in *BC. Syrique*: they are in the catalogue of Pompey's troops at 3.214 *Syriae populi*. Metellus Scipio had levied large forces for Pompey from Syria, his province in 49 (*Caes. Civ.* 3.32). *Cappadoces*: (cf. 225–6n.) in the Pompeian catalogue at 3.244; their support for Pompey is attested by *Caes. Civ.* 3.4.3 and *App. BCiv.* 2.49.202, 2.71.295. *Gallique*: 231n. *extremique orbis Hiberi* 'Spaniards from the ends of the earth' (with *extremi orbis* as descriptive genitive), or 'the farthest inhabitants of the Spanish region' (with *extremi* as nominative). The sequence of proper nouns in these lines suggests that *Hiberi* is the subject; for *extremi* as nominative cf. *Liv.* 24.49.5 (of Mauretanians) *extremi prope Oceanum aduersus Gades colunt*. *Armenii*: cf. 281; they are listed among Pompey's troops at 3.245. *Cilices*: 222–3n.

**542–3 nam post ciuilia bella | hic populus Romanus erit:** after the Romans have killed each other in civil war, these peoples will become the Roman people because there will be no one else; cf. 404–5. *hic* refers to 540 *istis*, the nations enumerated at 540–2; the pronoun is attracted into the number of the predicate.

**543–4 resume the narrative from 535 to conclude the cavalry rout. semel ortus in omnes | it timor:** cf. *Virg. A.* 8.556–7 *propiusque periclo | it timor*. *timor* is delayed for emphasis.

**544 et fatis datus est pro Caesare cursus** 'and their course was granted to the fates on behalf of Caesar', i.e. all obstacles to his destined victory were now removed; cf. *Sil.* 5.201–2 (of the Battle of Lake Trasimene) *auertere dei uultus fatoque dederunt | maiori non sponte locum*. For *cursus* as the 'course of fate' cf. *Sen. Nat.* 2.35.2 *fata . . . cursum irreuocabilem ingressa ex destinato fluunt*; in *BC* at 5.41 *fatorum . . . cursum*, 5.88 *deus omnia cursus aeterni secreta tenens*, 5.239, 6.423 (cf. *TLL* iv.1538.39–46 for further examples).

## 545–556 THE CENTRE OF THE BATTLE

This twelve-line panel divides evenly. The first six lines (545–50) describe a suddenly effective opposition to Caesar and account for it on the grounds that here he encounters not foreign forces but legions comprised of Roman citizens, the fathers and brothers of Caesar's own legions (550). The apostrophe to Caesar at 551 appears to mark the move to a narrative



of Caesar's crimes in this part of the battlefield. However, here – at the much-delayed point at which Romans actually fight Romans, their own brothers and fathers (cf. 550n.; 'probably the central and most important event of his epic', O'Higgins 1988: 216) – the narrator intervenes. He addresses his own mind directly, telling it to recoil from this subject matter and deploring the prospect that future ages should learn of such evil through his poetry (552–6). He concludes with an explicit declaration, now addressed to the soldiers collectivized as *Roma*, that he will remain silent on this part of the battle. The flat pronouncement *tacebo* represents an extreme point in the poem for the narrator's performed conflict regarding his compulsion to commemorate the war and his desire to preserve silence about *nefas*, literally the 'unspeakable' (Feeney 1991: 276), with which civil war has been equated since the poem's beginning (cf. e.g. 1.37, 2.4). On these lines see Johnson 1987: 97–9; O'Higgins 1988: 215–16; Feeney 1991: 276–7; Masters 1992: 147–8; Ormand 1994: 53–4; Leigh 1997a: 101–3; Hardie 2013: 234–5.

**545 uentum erat** 'they had come': the impersonal passive of an intransitive verb (A–G §208 (d); NLS §60) stresses the action rather than the agent (the Caesarians). **robur Magni** 'the main strength of Pompey's army' (*OLD robur* 8), suggesting a pun on Pompey's programmatic comparison to an oak tree at 1.135–43 (*OLD robur* 2 'the solid part of a living oak, the trunk or sim.'). **mediasque cateruas**: epexegetic of *robur*. For *cateruas* see 337–8n.

**546–7 quod totos errore uago perfuderat agros | constitit hic bellum, fortunaque Caesaris haesit** 'the battle which in its wandering course had flooded over all the fields stood still here, and Caesar's fortune came to a standstill'. *fortunaque Caesaris haesit*: i.e. it was delayed by encountering the stout opposition of Roman legions, in contrast to the foreign cavalry, routed so easily at 525–35; for *haesit* (here sharpened by the jingle *Caesaris haesit*) cf. Virg. A. 11.289–90 *Hectoris Aeneaeque manu uictoria Graium | haesit*. The notion is of infantry clashing with equal force and thus preventing any movement, as at Virg. A. 10.361 *haeret pede pes densusque uiro uir* (Oakley on Liv. 6.12.10 gives further examples). The fluvial metaphor chimes with epic comparisons of armies clashing and the hero's progress on the battlefield with flooding rivers: Hom. *Il.* 4.452–6 (armies clashing), 5.85–8 (Diomedes); Virg. A. 12.523–5 (Aeneas and Turnus). It also evokes the poetic symbolism of rivers in spate as images of the grand style (e.g. Prop. 3.3.15–16; Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.5–8 with Thomas), whose most typical application is the battle narrative (116, 224nn.).

**548–9 non illic regum auxiliis collecta iuuentus | bella gerit ferrumque manus mouere rogatae**: the details echo Caesar's estimate of Pompey's

foreign auxiliaries: cf. 270 *Grais delecta iuuentus* | *gymnasiis. illic* refers to the same place as 547 *hic. regum auxiliis collecta iuuentus* ‘forces assembled from the royal auxiliary contingents’. *iuuentus*: men of military age (*OLD* 1b); for the eastern kings under Pompey’s command see 56n. *ferrumque manus mouere rogatae*: -*que* has the force of *neque*, as at e.g. 9.590 (Cato) *nulla uehitur ceruice supinus* | *carpentoque sedens*. *manus* blurs the distinction between ‘hands’ (*OLD manus* 1) and ‘armed forces’ (*OLD* 22; Dinter 2012: 32–3). *manus rogatae* (cf. 4.234 *sollicitas reges* with *ASL ad loc.*: ‘*scilicet ad auxilia destinanda*’) alludes to the same questionable commitment of foreign auxiliaries in a Roman conflict that Caesar had raised at 281–3.

**550 ille locus fratres habuit, locus ille parentes:** this line caps the negative enumeration of details at 548–9; chiasmus and homeoteleuton add emphasis. On negative enumeration in Lucan see Bramble 1983: 544–57. A battle between brothers and fathers delivers the very definition of civil war *nefas* (cf. e.g. 4.169–72), the prospect of which book 7 has been holding out since 180–4 (cf. 320–5, 453–4, 462–6) and to which the poem has been building since 1.4 *cognatas acies*.

**551 hic furor, hic rabies, hic sunt tua crimina, Caesar:** understand the possessive adjective in each clause; *crimina* ‘crimes’ (*OLD* 4), as at 2.186–7 *tam saeui criminis, unum* | *tot poenas cepisse caput*. This line will be echoed at 557 *hic Caesar, rabies populis stimulusque furorum*. *furor* (× 49 in *BC*; cf. 95n.) and *rabies* (× 20 in *BC*; cf. 245n.) are both important thematic words in the poem and are both strongly associated with Caesar.

**552 hanc fuge, mens, partem belli:** cf. Virg. *G.* 4.2 *hanc etiam, Maecenas, aspic partem*. The separation of the pronominal adjective and its noun is emphatic; this initial command suggests the narrator as a deserter from battle. Apostrophes to one’s own mind are typical of tragedy (Gagliardi 1975 *ad loc.*); cf. e.g. Pac. *trag.* 284–5 *consternare, anime, ex pectore aude euoluere* | *consilium subito, mens, quod enatumst modo*. The narrator’s appeal to his own mind is also a reminder of his ‘un-epic divorce from the muses’ (Feeney 1991: 277); cf. 1.63–6. **tenebrisque relinque:** cf. 9.985–6 (the narrator to Caesar) *Pharsalia nostra* | *uiuet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aeuo* (with Hardie 2013: 234–5).

**553–4 nullaue . . . aetas:** the long hyperbaton imparts emphasis.

**553 tantorum . . . me uate malorum:** ablative absolute (as at Hor. *Epod.* 16.66 *uate me*); for *uates* + gen. cf. Prop. 2.17.3 *horum ego sum uates* (with Shackleton Bailey 1956: 97). *me uate* draws attention to the incongruity of the narrator’s role *qua uates* – that of an inspired, pious poet singing national themes (‘the Augustan national priest-prophet-poet’, Leigh 1997a: 102) – and to his desire to avert his mind in grief from his

destructive subject matter. Leigh notes that in each moment of Lucan's self-identification as *uates* (1.63–6, here and strongly implied at 9.980–6) the term points to a tradition from which he has excluded himself. See further Newman 1967: 99–206; O'Higgins 1988; Leigh 1997a: 16–19, 102–3.

**554 *quam multum bellis liceat ciuilibus*:** an indirect question. For the phrase cf. 1.8 *quae tanta licentia ferri?*, 2.60 (Brutus, on Cato entering the war) '*ne tantum, o superi, liceat feralibus armis*'.

**555 *a potius pereant lacrimae pereantque querellae*:** these are the tears and protests of a future age (554 *aetas*) upon hearing such horrors, were the narrator to recount them. Lucan would rather be silent and forgo the emotions that his narrative of these events would unleash in its audience (cf. ASL '*dicente enim me, quae gesta sunt, quisquis audiet, flebit; tacente nulla erit causa lacrimarum*'). Such a narrative would dash the anticipatory emotions predicted at 210–11. The tone is highly impassioned (for *pereant*, here in pathetic repetition, cf. TLL x<sup>1</sup>.1340.47–55) and can be compared to a number of highly fraught interjections in elegy (cf. e.g. Tib. 2.5.105 *pace tua pereant arcus pereantque sagittae*; Prop. 1.11.30 *a pereant Baiae, crimen amoris, aquae*; Ov. Ep. 19.105 *a, potius peream, quam crimine uulnerer isto*).

**556 *tacebo*** 'I will say nothing about' (OLD 4). The promise of silence is disproved by the following lines ('compelled by the force of his narrative and its madness to continue narrating that madness', Hershkovitz 1998: 197). For an adaptation of this narrative strategy cf. Stat. Theb. 11.577–9 *omnibus in terris scelus hoc omnique sub aeuo | uiderit una dies, monstrumque infame futuris | excidat, et soli memorent haec proelia reges* (with Ganiban 2007: 203). Statius alludes to this line at Silv. 2.7.104 (Calliope's fear of oblivion for the dead Lucan) (*o dirum scelus, o scelus!*) *tacebis*.

## 557–585 CAESAR IN THE CENTRE

**557 *hic Caesar*:** in contrast to the anonymity of 545 *uentum erat*, the same part of the battle is now treated with a focus upon Caesar. ***rabies populis stimulusque furorum*** 'a frenzy for the masses and a spur to madness', in apposition to the subject: Caesar now embodies the principal metaphors of the civil war (551n.; for *rabies*: 51n.; for *furor*: 95n.). *populus* can be used of an army (Dyck on Cic. Leg. 3.9.5; TLL x<sup>1</sup>.2716.35–44). *populis* (V) is better than *populi* (Ω): cf. Prop. 1.8.15 *tibi sim . . . furor* (Housman).

**558 *nequa parte sui pereat scelus*:** either 'lest criminality be lost in any section of his army' (*sui*: sc. *exercitus*) or, as Weise thought, 'lest the

criminality fail in any part of itself' (*sui*: sc. *sceleris ipsius*). The latter is more pointed; for the notion of criminality itself as something that must not be wasted cf. Sen. *Thy.* 1097–8 (Atreus) *perdideram scelus, | nisi sic dolores*.

**558–9 agmina circum | it uagus atque ignes animis flagrantibus addit:** the movement described is more commonly a desperate rallying of wavering troops: cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.495–6 (= 6.104–5) (Hector) πάλλων δ' ὅξεε δοῦρε κατὰ στρατὸν ὥχετο πάντῃ, | ὀτρύνων μαχέσασθαι, ξγείρε δὲ φύλοπιν αἰνὴν 'and brandishing his two sharp spears he went everywhere throughout the army, urging them to fight, and roused the dread din of battle'; *Ilias* 495–7 (Agamemnon) *ut uidit socios infesto cedere Marte | rex Danaum, sublimis equo uolat agmina circum | hortaturque duces animosque in proelia firmat. ignes animis flagrantibus addit*: Pompeian spirits blaze at 383; cf. Tac. *Hist.* 1.24 *flagrantibus iam militum animis uelut faces addiderat Maenius Pudens*.

**560–7** Feeney 1991: 296, Lovatt 2013: 118 and Chaudhuri 2014: 176 liken Caesar to an epic god, motivating troops, inspecting battle and staunching wounds, a reading encouraged by the comparison of Caesar to Bellona and Mars at 567–70. Caesar's frenetic activity further suggests a parody of the active concern of the good general (Leigh 1997a: 103): cf. 9.587–93 (Cato in Libya); Sal. *Cat.* 60.4 *interea Catilina cum expeditis in prima acie uorsari, laborantibus succurrere, integros pro sauciis arcessere, omnia prouidere, multum ipse pugnare, saepe hostem ferire: strenui militis et boni imperatoris officia simul exsequebatur*. The sentence is organized as a sequence of eight indirect questions dependent upon 560 *inspicit*.

**560 qui toti sanguine manent:** because they have been driven in to the hilt, in contrast to the swords of the following line; cf. Liv. 1.59.1 (Lucretia's knife) *cultrum . . . manantem cruore*.

**561 qui niteant primo tantum mucrone cruenti** 'which gleam, blood-stained only at the tip of their point' (*OLD* *primus* 2b).

**562 presso . . . ense** 'as it grips the sword' (*OLD* *premo* 1b), as at 4.705–6. **tremat . . . manus:** armed Caesarian hands last trembled at the Massilian grove (3.429).

**562–3 quis languida tela, | quis contenta ferat:** *tela* and *ferat* are understood in both clauses. *languida* 'drooping' (*OLD* 2) or 'slack' (*OLD* 5); *contenta* 'tense' (*OLD* 3), cf. 469 *tensis . . . lacertis*.

**563 quis praestet bella iubenti:** *praestet* 'provides' (*OLD* 10); *iubenti* (indirect object): i.e. only when ordered.

**564 quem pugnare iuuat:** cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.38–40 (Mars) *quem iuuat clamor galeaeque leues | acer et Marsi peditis cruentum | uultus in hostem. ciue*

**perempto:** ablative absolute; an emotive pairing (repeated at 772): cf. Liv. 22.6.3 (Ducarius) ‘*hanc uictimam manibus peremptorum foede ciuium dabo*’. *perimo* is a poeticism (Paul Fest. p. 217 Lindsay).

**565 obit latis proiecta cadauera campis:** *obit* ‘visits to inspect’ (OLD 2). *cadauera* may well suggest the dead (cf. Lucr. 6.1155 *perolent proiecta cadauera*; TLL III.13.74–6), but these are wounded soldiers, not corpses (as at 3.720 *ex magna defunctum parte cadauer*; cf. TLL III.13.43–9). The scene both momentarily echoes the behaviour of Erictho (e.g. 6.550 (lurking by) *quodcumque iacet nuda tellure cadauer*, 6.625–6 *pererrat* | *corpora caesorum tumulis proiecta negatis*) and foreshadows the carnage of the aftermath at 787–95. *cadauer* is favoured by Lucan, often for its shock-value; it is avoided by many poets (× 36 in *BC*; once each in Virg. *A.* and Ov. *Met.*). *latis* . . . *campis*: a conventional detail (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 14.145 εὐρὺ . . . πεδῖον; Virg. *A.* 11.465).

**566–7 uulnera multorum totum fusura cruorem | opposita premit ipse manu:** Caesar’s personal first aid might evoke the duty of the good general ‘to bring aid to the wearied’ in battle (Onasander 34.6 ἐπαμύνειν τοῖς κάμνουσι; cf. Sal. *Cat.* 60.4 at 560–7n.); cf. also Cato’s prompt but futile presence at the death of his soldiers at 9.884–9. *fusura* ‘that would have poured forth’: the future participle (here in place of a relative clause) represents the apodosis of an implied condition (e.g. *nisi pressisset*; cf. Shackleton Bailey 1956: 13 on Prop. 1.3.32 *moraturis*). *premit* ‘applies pressure’ (OLD 1a).

**567 uagatur:** echoing 559 *it uagus*; cf. Sal. *Jug.* 98.1 (Marius) *uagari passim ac modo laborantibus suis succurrere, modo hostis, ubi confertissimi obstiterant, inuadere*.

**568 sanguineum ueluti quatiens Bellona flagellum:** cf. Virg. *A.* 8.703 [*Discordia*] *quam cum sanguineo sequitur Bellona flagello*; Sen. *De ira* 2.35.6 *sanguineum quatiens dextra Bellona flagellum*. Bellona (< *bellum*) was the Roman goddess of war; the ecstatic worship of her acolytes is counted among the omens of civil war at 1.565–7. In literature Bellona is often portrayed as a Fury (Fishwick 1967: 155), hence her scourge; Sen. *Med.* 962 (of Megaera) *excusso* . . . *flagello*; Stat. *Theb.* 7.579–81 *has ubi uipere tactas ter utramque flagello* | *Eumenis in furias* . . . | *impulit*.

**569–71** Cf. Virg. *A.* 12.331–3 (Turnus, raging in battle) *qualis apud gelidi cum flumina concitus Hebri | sanguineus Mauors clipeo increpat atque furentis | bella mouens immittit equos*. Here the notion is that Mars in his chariot is rousing the Thracians to war against another race, who are supported by Athena (Housman).

**569 Bistonas aut Mauors agitans:** *Mauors* was considered the archaic form of *Mars*; *Mavors* and *Bellona* appear together *in medio certamine* on the shield of Aeneas (Virg. *A.* 8.700–3). The *Bistones* were a people of Thrace, a region traditionally associated with Mars (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 13.301; Eur. *Alc.* 498 (Ares) Ἐρηκίας . . . ἄναξ ‘lord of Thrace’; Ov. *Met.* 3.542 (Thracians) *proles Mauortia*). *agitans* ‘rousing them [for warfare]’ (*OLD* 9): cf. 2.643–4 (Pompey to Sextus) ‘*totoque urbes agitabis in orbe | perdomitas*’; Sen. *Thy.* 369–70 *reges . . . | qui sparsos agitant Dahas* (with Tarrant).

**569–70 si uerbere saeuo | Palladia stimulet turbatos aegide currus** ‘if with his savage whip he should goad horses alarmed by the aegis of Pallas’ (a ‘future less-vivid’ conditional); the *currus* stands by brachylogy for the horses pulling it, as at Virg. *A.* 12.287 (see *OLD* *stimulo* 1a). *stimulet* of *Mavors* picks up 557 *stimulusque furorum* of Caesar. For the noun-based adjective *Palladia* see 146n. on *Martius*.

**571 nox ingens scelerum est:** the main clause after the indefinite relative at 567 *quacumque uagatur* and the result of Caesar’s efforts at 560–7. *nox* figuratively denotes the chaos of battle (*OLD* 4b), as at 4.244 *caeca bellorum in nocte*. *ingens*, a particular favourite of Virgil (× 168 in the *Aeneid*), is used more sparingly by Lucan (× 34 in *BC*; cf. Ov. *Met.* × 61). The frequency with which Lucan prodelides *est* after final *-m* is mid-way between Virgilian and Ovidian usage (Virg. *A.* × 28; Ov. *Met.* × 118; Luc. × 77).

**571 caedes oriuntur:** cf. Virg. *A.* 2.411 *oriturque miserrima caedes* (repeated at 11.885). Here, so soon after the figurative use of *nox*, *oriuntur* may suggest a paradoxical ‘dawn’ of carnage (*OLD* *orior* 1a).

**571–2 et instar | immensae uocis gemitus:** cf. Virg. *A.* 11.832–3 (upon Camilla’s death) *tum uero immensus surgens ferit aurea clamor | sidera. instar* ‘equivalent to’ (+ gen.) is an indeclinable neuter noun found only in the nominative or accusative; it is in apposition to *gemitus*. The effect of a single, immeasurable voice is uncanny. The immeasurable, in its power to defy comparison, is an index of the sublime. Lucan’s frequent use of *immensus* (× 23 in *BC*) is one strategy of conveying the sublimity of his subject matter (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.7–8 on Pindar’s grand style): at 1.68 the poem is an *immensum opus*; at 1.466 Caesar’s forces are *immensae collecto robore uires*; at 3.290 *Fortuna* will send Pompey’s forces *immensae . . . ruinae*; at 294 Caesar has visions of the senate and nations swimming *immensa . . . in caede*; see further Day 2013: 72–105 on scale and Lucan’s sublime.

**572–3 et pondere lapsi | pectoris arma sonant** ‘and armour resounds with the weight of the fallen breast’. Lucan perhaps implies the cuirassed soldier falling on top of his weapons; the line reworks a Homeric

detail: e.g. *Il.* 5.58 ἦριπτε δὲ πρηνῆς, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ 'he fell face-down, and over him his armour rattled'.

**573 confractique ensibus enses:** the polyptoton *ensibus enses* recalls 1.6–7 *infestisque obuia signis | signa, pares aquilas et pila minantia pilis*.

**574 ipse manu** echoes 567; attention to the general's hands-on style reoccurs at 9.587 (Cato) *ipse manu sua pila gerit*. **subicit gladios ac tela ministrat:** chiasmic theme and variation; cf. Virg. A. 1.150 *furor arma ministrat*.

**575 aduersosque iubet ferro confundere uultus:** cf. 320–2n. *confundere* 'to mangle' (*OLD* 7a); cf. 2.191 *iuuit . . . Marii confundere uultum?* and Ov. *Met.* 5.58 *fractis confudit in ossibus ora* (with *TLL* IV.260.14–16).

**576 promouet ipse acies, impellit terga suorum:** theme and variation. *promouere* is the standard prose term for moving troops forward into battle (*TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.1895.18–35; cf. e.g. Liv. 2.30.12 *consul Romanus nec promouit aciem . . . defixis pilis stare suos iussit*); *impellere* is a close equivalent (*TLL* VII<sup>1</sup>.537.39).

**577 uerbere conuersae . . . hastae:** i.e. with the butt of his spear, as at Virg. A. 9.609–10 *uersaque iuuencum | terga fatigamus hasta*. **cessantes excitat:** cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.14–16 *populus frequens | ad arma, cessantes ad arma | concitet*.

**578 in plebem . . . ire** 'to attack the rank and file' (*OLD* eo<sup>1</sup> 7a, *plebs* 3; *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.2386.74–2387.11; as at 6.144). *plebem* is also political in sense: 'the commons, plebeians' (*OLD* 1a), in contrast with *senatum* at the end of the line.

**579–81** *scit* introduces four indirect questions (*qui, quae, unde, quo*). *cruor imperii qui sit, quae uiscera rerum:* Caesar's assault on the body politic 'enact[s] the proem' (Leigh 1997a: 209 n. 50), i.e. 1.2–3 *populumque potentem | in sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra*; cf. also 293–4 (Caesar's vision) *'sparsumque senatus | corpus'*, 491 *dextras Romana in uiscera ducit*, 721–2 (the narrator speaks) *tu, Caesar, in alto | caedis adhuc cumulo patriae per uiscera uadis*. *cruor* is more commonly blood from a wound; here it is a synonym of *sanguis* (*OLD* *cruor* 3). The *uiscera* figuratively denote those elements most essential for survival (*OLD* 2b); cf. Virg. A. 6.833 (to Caesar and Pompey) *neu patriae ualidas in uiscera uertite uires*; Liv. 32.21.18 *uiscera Italiae*. The pairing *imperii* and *rerum* may also evoke such formulations as Liv. 5.54.7 (the Capitol) *caput rerum summamque imperii*. The metaphor of the body politic is very common (cf. *OLD* *corpus* 6c; *TLL* IV.1006.58–78). In Menenius Agrippa's fable at Liv. 2.32.8–12, the state is imagined as a body with the senate as its stomach.



**580 unde petat Romam** ‘from where to attack Rome’ (not ‘the starting point of his course to Rome’, Braund).

**580–1 libertas ultima mundi | quo steterit ferienda loco** ‘in what place the freedom of the world has taken its stand for the final time, ready to be struck down’ (*OLD ultimus* 4c). At 432–6 the narrator had cited the Battle of Pharsalus as causing the permanent departure of *libertas* from Roman lands; at 696–7 the eternal ideological conflict remaining after the battle is framed as Caesar and *libertas*.

**581–2 permixta secundo | ordine nobilitas:** cf. 2.101 (under Marius) *nobilitas cum plebe perit*. *nobilitas* technically describes anyone descended from a curule magistrate (Gelzer 1969), but Lucan probably uses the term loosely in the sense ‘the aristocracy’ (*OLD* 3b). *secundus ordo* denotes equestrians: Stat. *Silv.* 4. pr. (Septimius Severus) *inter ornatissimos secundi ordinis*.

**582–3 uenerandaque corpora ferro | urgentur** ‘and venerable bodies are hard pressed by the sword’ (*OLD urgueo* 5a). For *ueneranda* see 17–18n. (*uenerabilis*).

**583 caedunt . . . caeduntque:** repetition of the verb adds vividness and concentrates attention on the commencement of an action whose narrative has been much delayed.

**583–4 caedunt Lepidos caeduntque Metellos | Coruinosque simul Torquataque nomina:** apart from Domitius Ahenobarbus (599–614), no other notable republicans are named as casualties at Pharsalus. Other aristocratic deaths are alluded to at Cic. *Phil.* 2.71; Sen. *Ep.* 71.9; and App. *BCiv.* 2.82.346 (ten senators and about forty equestrians). Lucan’s thematic emphasis upon Pharsalus as the death of liberty and the equation of the senate with that liberty has compelled him to invent prominent senatorial casualties. He has thus seized upon four emotive names of the republican nobility: the plurals may be taken as generalizing (‘men like’), as at 358–9. See Ahl 1976: 50–1; Lounsbury 1976: 222–3; on Lucan’s distortion of history in book 7 see Masters 1994. *Lepidos*: a cognomen of the Aemilii. Lucan may not have been aware that the most prominent men thus named in the 50s and 40s were supporters of Caesar: M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 46, 42) and L. Aemilius Lepidus Paullus (cos. 50). *Metellos*: Pompey’s father-in-law, Q. Caecilius Metellus Piso Scipio Nasica (222–3n.), survived Pharsalus to assume chief command of the republican forces in Africa in 47. The tribune of 49, L. Caecilius Metellus (3.114–68), also survived the battle (Cic. *Att.* 11.7.2). *Coruinosque*: the most famous Corvinus in this period, M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (cos. suff. 31), fought for Cassius at Philippi and for Octavian at Actium. *Torquataque*



*nomina*: L. Manlius Torquatus (pr. 49) fought against Caesar at Oricium and Dyrrachium before dying with Metellus Scipio at Thapsus. *nomina* implies the individual bearing the name (*OLD* 17a); for the phrase cf. 6.795 (the cadaver) ‘*uidi ego laetantes, popularia nomina, Drusus*’.

**584–5** *rerum | saepe duces* ‘often leaders of the state’ (*OLD res* 16).

**585** *summosque hominum te, Magne, remoto* ‘and the loftiest of men, setting you aside, Magnus’ (*OLD remoueo* 6).

## 586–596 BRUTUS

Brutus first appears at 2.234–325, where he debates with Cato whether or not to enter the war. There he receives the heroic epithet *magnanimus*; he is described as immune to the common fear and grief at Caesar’s invasion (234–5). In his speech, Brutus presents himself as a devotee of Cato (247) and counsels him against entering the war (266–81). He then declares that if Cato should take up arms, he himself will be an enemy, not of Pompey or Caesar, but of whoever becomes the victor (281–4), a statement foreshadowing his assassination of Caesar. Cato’s reply (286–323) is said to stir in Brutus an excessive love of civil war (323–5). Brutus’ role as future assassin of Caesar clearly dominates the present scene; the other key theme is the precipitate nature of his attack, which may recall for the reader the excessive enthusiasm engendered in him by Cato’s speech. For other allusions to Brutus’ role in Caesar’s assassination see 5.206–8, 6.791–2 and 10.338–44. Recurring themes in these allusions are the influence of *fortuna* and *fatum* in Caesar’s assassination (5.208, 10.339, 10.341; cf. 7.595); that his death is a punishment for the civil war (5.206 *furorum*, 10.340) and for his tyranny (5.207 *regna*, 6.791, 10.343; cf. 7.593–5); and that it is the revenge of a conquered senate (10.340; cf. 7.588). The exemplary function of Caesar’s death would be lost (10.344 *exemplumque perit*) if the assassination were to take place without Brutus; so too if it were to take place before Caesar surpassed all limits to his power (593–6).

Some critics have seen the historical Lucan identifying with the tyrannicide (Ahl 1976: 46; Martindale 1984: 72); for others (Leigh 1997a: 107), Brutus betokens the inadequacies of Caesar’s aristocratic opponents at Pharsalus. See further Lounsbury 1976: 228; Hardie 1993: 55–6; Leigh 1997a: 107–9.

**586–7** *illic plebeia contectus casside uultus | ignotusque hosti quod ferrum, Brute, tenebas!* two consecutive, heavily spondaic lines dignify Brutus’ appearance in the battle. *plebeia contectus casside uultus* ‘your face covered by a common helmet’; *uultus*: accusative of respect and plural

for singular. The Iunii Bruti were of the plebeian nobility, but as often in military contexts, *plebeia* here denotes the rank and file (*TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.2377.58–64). The *cassis* itself does not signify class; at Caes. *Gal.* 7.45.2 muleteers wear it to look like cavalry, but few authors make any distinction between it and the *galea*. Brutus' disguise in common garb recalls the senate in hiding at 2.18–19 *latuit plebeio tectus amictu | omnis honos*; cf. also Caesar's orders at 578 not to attack the plebs (Masters 1994: 175 n. 65). *ignotusque hosti*: an anonymity in high contrast to the famous name he bears (589). *quod ferrum*: exclamatory. The notion is 'how celebrated it will be' (Housman): the conceit is that this is the sword with which Brutus will assassinate Caesar.

**588 o decus imperii, spes o suprema senatus:** cf. Virg. *A.* 2.281 (Aeneas to Hector's ghost) '*o lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum*'; Lucan preserves the anastrophe and chiasmus of his model and adds alliteration. *decus* of persons is a common honorific (again at 597 *patriae . . . decus*): cf. e.g. Cic. *Phil.* 2.54 (Pompey) *imperi populi Romani decus ac lumen fuit. spes* anticipates his assassination of Caesar.

**589 extremum tanti generis per saecula nomen:** *per saecula* is adverbial with *tanti*. The clausula signals future permanence at Virg. *A.* 6.235 (Misenus) *aeternumque tenet per saecula nomen*; this line commemorates former glory and points via *extremum* to the imminent extinction of the Iunii Bruti, who did not survive into the imperial period. *nomen* denotes a bearer of the cognomen Brutus (cf. Liv. 1.56.8), acquired by L. Iunius and bequeathed to his branch of the *gens Iunia*. On the Iunii Bruti see Syme 1986: 197–8; *OCD* s.v. 'Brutus'.

**590** The reckless charge is described in rapid dactyls. An admonition to avoid the fight is an inversion of epic norms (Gorman 2001: 270). **ne rue:** *ne* + *imp.* is an archaism revived in the Augustan period; it remained thereafter a poeticism (*NLS* §128 (ii)). **nimium temerarius:** a character trait established at 2.325 (Cato's effect on Brutus) *excitat in nimios belli ciuilis amores* (Ahl 1976: 246–7).

**591 tibi . . . admoueris** 'bring upon yourself' (*OLD* 12). **fatales** 'deadly' (*OLD* 4b; Brutus committed suicide after the defeat of the republican forces at Philippi on 23 October 42), but also 'fated' (expressing a confidence in destiny in contrast to the essentially Epicurean conclusion of 445–55; Feeney 1991: 282).

**592 Thessalia periture tua** 'destined to die in your own Thessaly'; the future participle expresses certainty, as often (A–G §499.1; e.g. Virg. *A.* 9.642 *geniture deos*). Philippi was in Eastern Macedonia (Barrington 51C2); the geographical imprecision appears to stem from misreading Virg. *G.*

1.489–92 *ergo inter sese paribus concurrere telis | Romanas acies iterum uidere Philippi; | nec fuit indignum superis bis sanguine nostro | Emathiam et latos Haemi pinguescere campos*; cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.823–4 *Pharsalia sentiet illum, | Emathiique iterum madefient caede Philippi* (see Ahl 1976: 314–15; Mynors 1990: 94–5).

**593 iugulo:** 434<sup>n</sup>.

**593–5 nondum attigit arcem, | iuris et humani columen, quo cuncta premuntur, | egressus meruit fatis tam nobile letum** ‘he has not yet attained the citadel of tyranny, and he has not yet, having gone beyond the summit of human law by which all things are dominated, deserved from the fates so famous a death’. Cf. 2.562–5 (Pompey) ‘*quo potuit ciuem populus perducere liber | ascendi, supraque nihil nisi regna reliqui. | non priuata cupis, Romana quisquis in urbe | Pompeium transire paras*’. Caesar’s future political dominance is expressed metaphorically in architectural terms. *arx* is used often in the context of tyrants: for its use with *premuntur* (in the sense ‘dominate’, OLD 16c) cf. Sen. *Thy.* 641–3 *in arce summa Pelopiae pars est domus | conuersa ad austros, cuius extremum latus | aequale monti crescit atque urbem premit* (with Tarrant). In Lucan’s phrase the legitimate *iuris* . . . *humani columen* (rather than the tyrannical *arx*) is strangely described as ‘dominating’. For *arx* and *columen* see Oakley on Liv. 6.37.10. *tam nobile letum*: cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.35–6 *Catonis | nobile letum*.

**596 uiuat et, ut Bruti procumbat uictima, regnet:** for *procumbere* of sacrificial victims cf. Catul. 64.389; Virg. *A.* 5.481. Pompey had been confident that Caesar would act as sacrificial victim at 350–1. Plut. *Caes.* 66.10–11 presents the assassination of Caesar in terms evoking the sacrifice (Pelling 2011: 65, 482); cf. also Florus 2.13.92 (Caesar’s honours) *quae omnia uelut infulae in destinatam morti uictimam congerebantur*.

## 597–616 THE DEATH OF L. DOMITIUS AHENOBARBUS

The great-great-grandfather of the emperor Nero was the only senatorial casualty at Pharsalus who is known to us (Cic. *Brut.* 267; App. *BCiv.* 2.82.346). Lucan transfers to Domitius the kudos of a glorious death which in Caesar’s account belongs to Crastinus (470–5n.). Lucan’s version, in which Domitius dies in the thick of battle after boldly confronting Caesar, differs from Caes. *Civ.* 3.99.5 where he flees battle, is caught in the mountains and killed. Cicero confirms Caesar’s version and identifies M. Antonius as his killer (*Phil.* 2.71). Other sources record only his death with no further detail (Tac. *Ann.* 4.44.2; Suet. *Nero* 2.3; App. *BCiv.* 2.82.346). For Masters (1994: 167–8) Lucan’s version is a deliberate travesty of Caesar’s that is intended to lay bare for his reader the construction of tendentious partisan history out of the basic fact of Domitius’ death at

the battle. Lucan's Caesar appears even to hint at the Caesarian version of events at 606–7 (n.) '*Magni deseris arma | . . . sine te iam bella geruntur*'.

At 2.478–525 Domitius is betrayed by his own soldiers to Caesar at Corfinium and despite wishing for death receives a pardon. That scene ends with Domitius exhorting himself to seek a heroic death in battle (cf. 2.523–4 '*in medios belli non ire furores | iam dudum moriture paras?*'). Lucan suppresses any explicit mention of Domitius at Massilia, where he fled the conflict (Caes. *Civ.* 2.22; here in lines 600–2 *clades . . . per omnes, nusquam, totiens* may allude to this additional defeat).

Some have taken Lucan's version of the death of Domitius as designed to flatter Nero (e.g. Braund 1992: xv), a goal that seems incompatible with the denunciations of the principate elsewhere in book 7. The fact that Domitius dies in the attempt to prevent Caesar's victory may also argue against reading his death as flattering to Nero: 'two halves of Nero's origins meet on the battlefield on opposing sides, making Nero a true product of civil war' (Masters 1994: 174 n. 51). As the only identifiable senator dying at the battle and an implacable opponent of Caesar, Domitius is more probably given a glorious death by Lucan as the embodiment of dying senatorial *libertas* (cf. 602–3, 612–13; Lounsbury 1975: 225–6); in this aspect his death may be taken to foreshadow that of Cato, the poem's most probable telos.

The epic model for Domitius' death scene is the death of Patroclus at Hom. *Il.* 16.818–61. This scene is much expanded as the model for the death of Hector at the hands of Achilles at *Il.* 22.326–66 and is later echoed in the killing of Orodes by Mezentius at Virg. *A.* 10.739–46. These Homeric and Virgilian models feature an exchange of speeches in which an aggressor taunts his dying victim and the victim predicts a swift retribution from a more powerful ally. Domitius is shown to be deluded in the notion that Caesar will be conquered in battle and in his casting of Pompey as an Achilles figure who will avenge his death. This Homeric paradigm and the praise Lucan showers on the death of a minor character cast in sharp relief the absence of a summative confrontation between the poem's two protagonists. Domitius' death is a poor substitute for Pompey's, whose choice to live on is contextualized by Lucan's clear approval of Domitius' death, particularly since the same notion of untroubled peace claimed by the dying Domitius is attributed to the fleeing Pompey (612–13 *liber ad umbras | et securus eo*, cf. 686–7 *iam pondere fati | deposito securus abis*). See further Lounsbury 1976: 223–8; Masters 1994: 163–8; Leigh 1997a: 140–3; Fucecchi 2011: 251–2; Seo 2013: 82–3.

**597–8 hic patriae perit omne decus: iacet aggere magno | patricium campis non mixta plebe cadaver:** theme and variation. *hic patriae perit omne decus* (588n.): cf. Cic. *Flacc.* 75 (Castricius) *decus patriae, ornamentum*

*populi Romani, florem iuuentutis. iacet aggere magno*: piled corpses feature prominently in the poem: 2.160–1, 2.200–10 (Sullan victims); 3.627 (Romans at Massilia); 4.570–1 (Vulsteius' men); 6.153, 6.180–1 (Caesarians at Dyrrachium). *patricium . . . cadauer* (singular for plural): an emotive pairing: cf. 6.308 (Pompey) *nobilis . . . rege cadauer*; *cadauer*: 'a real and uncompromising word', rare in the *Aeneid* and *Metamorphoses* (Bramble 1983: 541; cf. 565n.). *non mixta plebe*: cf. 578 *in plebem uetat ire manus*.

**599–600** 'Nevertheless, amid the slaughter of famous men the death of belligerent Domitius was pre-eminent' (*OLD* *emineo* 3); *eminuit* is in contrast to 597–8 *iacet . . . cadauer* (< *cadere*). *mors*: Lucan much prefers this everyday word to *letum* ('lofty and archaic', Horsfall on Virg. A. 11.846). *clarorum in strage uirorum*: nine senators died apart from Domitius at Pharsalus (App. *BCiv.* 2.82.346). The *exitus illustrium uirorum* 'deaths of famous men' (typically victims of tyranny) was a thriving sub-genre in the first century CE (see *NP* s.v. '*exitus illustrium uirorum*'). *pugnacis Domiti* (583–4n.): Domitius is also called *pugnax* at 2.479 and 7.218; so too Metellus at 3.114: in *BC* the term points to continued defiance of Caesar.

**600–1** *quem clades fata per omnes | ducebant*: *clades* 'military defeat' (*OLD* 2): Corfinium, Pharsalus and, presumably, Massilia: see 597–616n. The phrase may also suggest destiny leading Domitius 'through all the carnage (*sc.* of the battle)' (*OLD* 2c): cf. 650–1 *omnes sparsas per Thessala rura | . . . clades*; Virg. A. 10.380 (Lagus) *fatis adductus iniquis*.

**601–2** *nusquam Magni fortuna sine illo | succubuit*: a brilliant *sententia* describes in hyperbole (*nusquam . . . sine illo*) Domitius' pardon at Corfinium and flight from Massilia: see 597–616n. *Magni fortuna*: 3.169; on Pompey and *Fortuna* in *BC* see 24n. *succubuit* 'conceded defeat' (*OLD* 3a), the verb may also evoke the metaphor of Pompey's fortune collapsing under a blow, like a victim (Catul. 64.369) or a tree (Sil. 5.502; *OLD* 1a).

**602–3** *salua | libertate perit*: the contrast with *uictus totiens* may suggest Domitius' personal freedom (cf. 612–13 '*liber ad umbras | et securus eo*') or reflect the fact that he died before Caesar's final defeat of *libertas* at Pharsalus. The same phrase will later denote a more general liberty: cf. 9.192–3 (Cato, about Pompey) '*salua | libertate potens*'.

**603–4** *mille in uulnera laetus | labitur* 'falls gladly into a thousand wounds': i.e. forward into the weapons. *uulnus* describes 'prospective wounds residing in missiles' (*OLD* 1c; cf. Virg. A. 9.745–6 *uulnus Saturnia Iuno | detorsit ueniens*).

**604** *ac uenia gaudet caruisse secunda*: he was first pardoned by Caesar at Corfinium, where Domitius' indignation is described: 2.509–25.

**605–6 uiderat in crasso uersantem sanguine membra | Caesar, et increp- itans:** cf. Virg. A. 11.669 *moriensque suo se in uulnere uersat*. *uiderat* ‘saw’; the pluperfect is used as an aorist (G–L 241 n. 1). *in crasso . . . sanguine* ‘in thick blood’, a periphrasis for *cruor* (292n.); cf. Virg. A. 5.469–70 *cras- sumque cruorem | ore eiectantem*. *increpitans* ‘reproaching’ (OLD 1a), with the nuance ‘mocking’, as at Virg. A. 10.898 (Mezentius) ‘*hostis amare, quid increpitās mortemque minaris?*’

**606–7 ‘iam Magni deseris arma, | successor Domiti; sine te iam bella geruntur’:** the metaphor *deseris arma* for *moreris* recalls Domitius’ actual flight from battle (see 597–616n.); Caesar ‘knows’ the tradition that the narrator is suppressing. *successor Domiti*: in 49 he received Transalpine Gaul in succession to Caesar (MRR II.260).

**608 dixerat** ‘he had spoken’ i.e. ‘he finished speaking’, a common formula to mark the end of a speech (the tense is not used in the same way as 605 *uiderat*).

**608–9 ast illi suffecit pectora pulsans | spiritus in uocem morientiaque ora resoluit:** *ast illi* shifts focus to Domitius; cf. Virg. A. 12.951 (Turnus) *ast illi soluuntur frigore membra* (with Tarrant). *suffecit* ‘had sufficient strength’, with *in* + acc. (OLD *sufficio* 4a). The succession of spondees (*ast illi suffecit*) and the alliterative clausula *pectora pulsans* may mimic Domitius struggling to speak. For *pectora pulsans* | *spiritus* cf. 128–9n. *moriens* is not uncommonly applied to parts of a dying person’s body (TLL VIII.1493.64–79).

**610 ‘non te funesta scelerum mercede potitum . . .’** ‘when you have not obtained the deadly wage of your crimes’ (OLD *potior* 1), a financial metaphor (cf. 750 *pretium belli*, 751 *quanta . . . mercede*). *merces* can take a genitive indicating the service meriting a reward (OLD 1a gives examples).

**610–11 potitum | . . . dubium . . . minorem:** all qualify *te*, the object of *aspiciens*.

**611 dubium fati** ‘uncertain of your fate’; cf. 31 *fati certus*. *dubius* + gen. is found first here. **generoque minorem** ‘inferior to your son-in-law’ (OLD *minor* 6a; cf. 53n.), evoking Pompey’s name. On the issue of their rivalry cf. 1.125–6 *nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarue priorem | Pompeiusue parem*.

**612 Magno duce** ‘while/because Pompey is (still) leader’ (ablative absolute), i.e. undefeated by Caesar. The phrase may also ironically be taken with *eo* to suggest Pompey leading the way to the underworld.

**612–13 liber . . . | et securus:** the terms evoke philosophical equanimity: cf. e.g. Sen. Ep. 37.3–4 *ad hanc [philosophiam] te confer, si uis saluus esse, si securus, si beatus, denique si uis esse, quod est maximum, liber*. They are often used in the context of a chosen death: cf. Sen. Ep. 70.16 *scalpello aperitur*

*ad illam magnam libertatem uia et puncto securitas constat*; Plin. *Ep.* 1.12.8 (Corellius Rufus) *securus liberque moriturus*.

**613 Marte subactum:** metonymy enlivens the common *bello subigere*; first in Lucan, also at 5.240, 7.735, 8.144.

**614 Pompeioque graues poenas nobisque daturum:** see 597–616n.

**615 sperare licet:** cf. 2.15 *liceat sperare timenti*. The conceit recalls Lucan's future readership who will feel hope and fear when they read of these events: cf. 185–213, 211nn.

**616 uita fugit:** cf. Virg. *A.* 11.831 = 12.952 (of Camilla and Turnus) *uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras*. **densaeque oculos mersere tenebrae** 'and thick shadows covered his eyes' (*OLD* *mergo* 7a); cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.461 τὸν δὲ σκότος ὅσσε κάλυπεν 'and darkness covered his eyes'. Oudendorp's conjecture *mersere* gives better sense than *uertere* Ω: as Housman *ad loc.* notes, eyes 'rolling' in death is not uncommon (he compares Virg. *A.* 8.438 *Gorgona desecto uertentem lumina collo*), but *densae tenebrae* are awkward as the subject of *uertere*, and Nutting 1931–3: 114 fails to convince that *uertere* has causative force ('the thickening darkness caused his eyes to roll'). *pressere* **G<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>** may be correct, but *mersere* seems more likely to have produced *uertere*.

## 617–646 THE NARRATOR DENOUNCES THE BATTLE

The focus on Brutus and Domitius may arouse the expectation that further individual examples of heroic prowess on the battlefield will follow. Instead, Lucan ends his attention to the battle itself with the assertion that when the whole world is dying it is shameful to weep for innumerable deaths and seek out individual fates (617–18). Lines 617–31 are effectively a *praeteritio*, a passing over of this subject. This is cast in the form of a series of indirect questions which recall the inquiries into the identities of victims that often precede *aristeia* narratives (cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.703–4; Virg. *A.* 11.664–5 (the narrator to Camilla) *quem telo primum, quem postremum, aspera uirgo, | deicis? aut quot humi morientia corpora fundis?*). The *praeteritio* solves for Lucan the problem of the low number of aristocratic deaths at the historical battle. It further implies a greater number of deaths than could possibly be recounted and suggests that a traditional epic *aristeia* narrative would be inadequate to the task of conveying the significance of Pharsalus (Gibson 2008: 92). The narrator had adopted a similar strategy in describing the atrocities committed under Marius and Sulla (cf. 2.118–19 *cui funera uulgi | flere uacat?* and 2.173–4 *quid sanguine manes | placatos Catuli referam?*). Although Cicero seems to have endorsed the *praeteritio* as a known poetic strategy for narrating Roman defeats at



*Man.* 25 (*sinite . . . sicut poetae solent qui res Romanas scribunt, praeterire me nostram calamitatem*), Lucan's motivation here and at 2.118–19 is not the national disaster but that one should not linger on individual deaths when so many died.

Lines 632–46 begin by justifying the omission of individual narratives (632–7) and end with a bitter denunciation of the battle (639–46). Pharsalus was an unprecedented disaster whose impact was felt throughout the world (632–7): deictic pronouns (633–5 *illic . . . hic . . . illic* | . . . *hic*) insistently and vividly draw the contrast between the individual deaths which decided previous battles and the collective and universal impact of Pharsalus. The battle's ramifications are explored in terms of geopolitics in 632–7 and time in 638–46. In these lines Lucan exploits not only the totalizing drive of epic – all space and all time – but also the aetiological function of epic to posit this battle as the original cause of the principate, here cast as unending servitude under a tyranny (640 *prosternimur*, 641 *seruiet*, 643 *regnum*): a forceful restatement of the same notion at 437–45. Quint 1993: 150–1 argues that this resigned pessimism should be balanced against other narratorial interventions such as 207–13, where the war and its stakes are kept 'imaginatively alive' for the reader, and 695–6, where the principate is cast as a perpetual ongoing struggle between Caesar and *libertas*. See further Quint 1993: 149–51; Leigh 1997a: 78–82; Gorman 2001: 271–2; Gibson 2008: 91–2; Day 2013: 207–10; *VEs.v.* 'aetiology', 'aristeia'.

**617–18 impendisse pudet lacrimas . . . | mortibus innumeris** 'I am ashamed to waste tears on innumerable deaths'; cf. 2.118–19 (quoted at 617–46n.). *impendisse* (*OLD* 3b) is a financial metaphor. The perfect tense of the infinitive is metrically convenient and equivalent in sense to the present (cf. 78n.).

**617 in funere mundi** 'amid the destruction of the world' (*OLD* in 40a, *funus* 3b), denoting the worldwide scale of the slaughter, cf. 3.169–70 and 296, quoted at 52–5n.

**618 singula fata** 'individual deaths', in contrast to *mortibus innumeris*.

**619 quaerere:** the second subject infinitive of *pudet*, it introduces the sequence of ten indirect questions at 619–30.

**619–26** 'Lucan conceives of the battlefield, not in terms of victor and victim, but in terms of weapon and wound. No one casts the spear or wields the sword, but each man dies, a bloody body part falling to an inanimate instrument of war' (Gorman 2001: 271).

**619–20 letiferum per cuius uiscera uulnus | exierit:** the compound *letifer* (first at Catul. 64.394) is a poeticism that Lucan favours (× 8),



compared to Virgil (A.:  $\times 2$ ) and Ovid (*Met.*:  $\times 5$ ); cf. 599–600n. on *mors. per cuius uiscera uulnus*: a graphic phrase enhanced by assonance; *uulnus* ‘weapon’ by metonymy (*OLD* 1c; 603–4n.). *exierit* ‘came out’, i.e. passed right through.

**620 quis fusa solo uitalia calcet:** cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.390–1 (Dorylas, wounded by Peleus) *terraque ferox sua uiscera traxit | tractaque calcavit calcataque rupit. fusa . . . calcet* ‘pours out and tramples on’ (*fusa* is the equivalent of a coordinate clause). The *uitalia* are presumably the soldier’s own vital parts.

**621–2** ‘who, confronting the enemy, drove out with his breath as he died the sword thrust into his throat’. This conceit varies a common hyperbole whereby blood drives out a weapon (3.590; Ov. *Met.* 6.259, 13.394), which itself adapts the notion of blood or the soul flowing out once a weapon has been withdrawn from the victim’s body (Hom. *Il.* 16.504–5; Virg. *A.* 10.486–7). It is also possible that Lucan is using *anima* as a metonym for blood since the Stoics considered blood the carrier of the soul: cf. 3.640–1 *discursusque animae diuersa in membra meatis | interceptus aquis* (with Hunink). *ore . . . aduerso*: ablative absolute; they received the wounds honourably, in the front of the body while facing forward, not turned in flight; cf. Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 36 *qui hasce ore aduerso pro re publica cicatrices ac notas uirtutis accepit. demissum faucibus ense*: cf. 6.239 (Aulus, killed by Scaeva) *fulmineum mediis excepit faucibus ense*.

**622 quis corruat ictus** ‘who collapses when struck’. The phrase could as easily describe a sacrificial victim (Andr. *com.* 2 *corruit quasi ictus secena*).

**623 quis steterit dum membra cadunt:** for amputation wounds in earlier epic cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.76–83; Virg. *A.* 10.395–6. In *BC* they feature more prominently in siege warfare and naval engagements than on the plain: see 3.611–17 (hands), 3.666 (arms), 4.786 (limbs), 6.175–6 (hands). Amputation wounds receive greater emphasis in *BC* than in other surviving epics (see Most 1992: 397–400).

**623–4 qui pectore tela | transmittant** ‘which men let weapons pass through their chest’; *transmittant* (*OLD* 5c) gains emphasis by enjambment and the strong caesura in the second foot.

**624 quos campis affixerit hasta:** epic warriors are not pinned to the plain by weapons until Idmon at Sil. 7.609–16 (although Paris seems momentarily to pin Diomedes’ foot to the plain with an arrow at Hom. *Il.* 11.375–8). This may be a grotesque variation on the detail of the spear lodged in earth either when the soldier rests (Hom. *Il.* 3.135; Virg. *A.* 6.652, 12.130) or when a throw has missed its mark (Hom. *Il.* 21.167–8; Virg. *A.* 12.773).

**625–6** *quis cruor emissis perruperit aera uenis | inque hostis cadat arma sui* ‘whose blood breaks through into the air when his veins have been drained, and falls onto the armour of its enemy’; cf. Lucr. 4.1049–51 *namque omnes plerumque cadunt in uulnus, et illam | emicat in partem sanguis unde icimur ictu, | et si comminus est, hostem ruber occupat umor. quis = quibus* (dative of reference: A–G §377); for *cruor* see 292n. *perrumpere* (OLD 2b) would more commonly describe the damaging force of a wound upon a body, rather than blood erupting from such a wound (TLL x<sup>1</sup>.1665.40–54); Cicero had described the ascending soul as breaking through *aer* (Tusc. 1.42, 1.43). *inque hostis cadat arma*: blood takes the place of a weapon or an onrushing soldier. *sui* logically applies to *quis*; but its grammatical effect is to sharpen the personification of *cruor* by attributing it to an enemy. *emissis* ΩC, the *lectio difficilior*, is the utterly appropriate term (see Housman *ad loc.*); it here imports a medical metaphor (cf. OLD 5b; Plin. Nat. 32.106 on draining abscesses). *emissus* M<sup>a</sup>G<sup>2</sup> is banal, and likelier to be a correction of *emissis*.

**626–30** Cf. 182–3 *quae patrum iugulos, quae pectora fratrum | sperabat*.

**626–8** *quis pectora fratris | caedat et, ut notum possit spoliare cadauer, | abscisum longe mittat caput*: enjambed *caedat* – a military term (Adams 1973: 291) and a stark choice with *pectora fratris* (cf. 4.246 *quae modo complexu fouerunt pectora caedunt*) – is revealed as a false climax, capped by the perverse reasoning and horrific details of 627–8 (and further enhanced by the heavy metre of 628). The killing of relatives was a topos of civil war narratives: see Woodman 1983: 116–17. I take it that they behead the body so as not to have to look at the face while despoiling it (cf. 628–9), but it may be that they cast the head away so that no one can see them despoiling their brother (cf. 630). Decapitating a relative to assuage guilt at plundering their corpse is unparalleled, but several passages offer partial context. Brother despoils brother at Eur. *Phoen.* 1416–17; family and friends are discovered among the dead by plunderers at Sal. *Cat.* 61.8 (*multi autem, qui e castris uisundi aut spoliandi gratia processerant, uolentes hostilia cadauera amicum alii, pars hospitem aut cognatum reperiebant; fuere item qui inimicos suos cognoscerent*). Beheading an enemy corpse serves either as the final humiliation of one’s opponent or to inspire fear in the enemy. It evidently occurred after despoliation: at Hom. *Il.* 17.125–7 Hector drags Patroclus’ already despoiled body towards Troy with the intention of decapitating it and giving the head to dogs; at *Il.* 18.175–7 Achilles threatens to do the same to Hector; cf. Virg. *A.* 10.862–3 (Turnus to his horse Rhaebus) ‘*hodie uictor spolia illa cruenti | et caput Aeneae referes*’; cf. Liv. 4.19.5 (Cossus beheads Tolumnius) *tum exsanguis detracta spolia caputque abscisum uictor spiculo gerens terrore caesi regis hostes fundit* (cf. 23.24.11). For

the phrase *abscisum longe mittat caput* cf. Virg. A. 9.771 (Turnus decapitates Lynceus) *cum galea longe iacuit caput*.

**628–9 ora parentis | quis laceret** cf. 322 (Caesar) ‘*uultus gladio turbate uerendos*’. *laceret* has shock-value with *ora parentis*; the verb points to the same logic as 627–8: i.e. to disfigure the corpse in order to remove physical reminders of kinship (cf. 322n.).

**629–30 nimiaque probet spectantibus ira | quem iugulat non esse patrem:** Leigh 1997a: 200–1 reads these lines as inverting the notion that an audience in battle prevents dishonourable deeds from being concealed (cf. Caes. *Gal.* 7.80.5 *quod in conspectu omnium res gerebatur neque recte aut turpiter factum celari poterat, utrosque et laudis cupiditas et timor ignominiae ad uirtutem excitabat*). *probet spectantibus* suggests the evaluative gaze of fellow soldiers: cf. Caes. *Gal.* 1.52.1, where legates and quaestors are given command of legions in battle so that each soldier might have a witness to his bravery (*uti eos testes suae quisque uirtutis haberet*). Naturally, Caesar’s gaze in particular is the most valued: cf. e.g. 6.158–9, where Scaeva wishes he could die with Caesar watching. Caesar’s gaze is claimed to elicit brave deeds from his soldiers at Caes. *Gal.* 2.25.3, 3.14.8–9 and at Plut. *Caes.* 16.3. Labienus twice exhorts his troops to imagine that the absent Caesar is watching them as they fight at Caes. *Gal.* 6.8.4, 7.62.2. See further Leigh 1997a: 199–203 and Lovatt 2013 on the epic gaze more generally.

**630–3** Bramble 1983: 547–55 draws attention to the manner in which Lucan frequently inverts the conventions of epic narration by means of *non* or *nullus*.

**630–1 mors nulla querella | digna sua est, nullosque hominum lugere uacamus:** cf. Cic. *Brut.* 157 *si . . . uolumus singulas res desiderare, non modo querendi sed ne lugendi quidem finem reperiemus*. Lucan offers two distinct explanations for an absence of individual death narratives: their unworthiness or inappropriateness (*mors nulla . . . digna*), and the constraints of the narrator (*nullosque hominum lugere uacamus*). *sua* ‘its own’, i.e. ‘exclusive’ (*OLD* 10a) or ‘proper’ (12a). *nullosque hominum lugere uacamus*: cf. 2.118–19 (quoted at 617–46n.). Only the impartial Cato is free to mourn at 2.377–8 *uni quippe uacat studiis odiisque carenti | humanum lugere genus. hominum* is partitive genitive with *nullos*.

**632–3 non istas habuit pugnae Pharsalia partes | quas aliae clades** ‘Pharsalus did not have those elements of battle that other defeats (had)’, i.e. individual deaths on a scale that can be recounted. The statement is an implicit apology for the absence of individual death narratives. *aliae clades* must, despite differing prosody, suggest the defeat at Allia in particular (390 BCE; cf. Serv. on Virg. A. 7.717, who read ‘*quas Aliae*

*clades*’); other famous defeats occurred at the Caudine Forks (321), Trebia (218), Trasimene (217), Cannae (216) and Arausio (105): cf. 408–9 (n.). *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.464.7–47 suggests that *partes* is transferred from the sense ‘part, role’ in a play or dialogue (*OLD* 9a), but the sense ‘a component part, an element, division’ (*OLD* 5a) better fits the context. Hyperbaton lends further emphasis to *istas*, which has no second-person nuance (for the construction *iste* . . . *qui* see *TLL* vii<sup>2</sup>.508.4–12). The nature of the hyperbole will be clarified in the following lines.

**633–5 *illic per fata uirorum, | per populos hic Roma perit; quod militis illic, | mors hic gentis erat*** explains 632–3 in theme and variation: paired clauses are tightly juxtaposed by chiasmus of adverbs of place and the key points of contrast (*illic per fata uirorum | per populos hic* . . . *militis illic |* . . . *hic gentis*). *illic*: in other battles, in contrast to *hic*, at Pharsalus. *per populos* ‘by the deaths of nations’ (*OLD* *populus* 1b); i.e. *per fata populorum*, a ‘compensious comparison’ (100–11n.), as lines 634–7 make clear.

**635–7** The climax of the sequence 632–7 contrasts not Pharsalus and former defeats but the scale of foreign and Roman blood spilt at Pharsalus.

**635–6 *sanguis ibi fluxit Achaeus, | Ponticus, Assyrius***: asyndeton enhances the impression of an abbreviated list encompassing all nations (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.50 on asyndeton’s amplifying effect on lists). *sanguis*: the final syllable is long: the original prosody of the word (cf. 2.338 with Fantham; Virg. *A.* 10.487 with Harrison). *ibi*: at Pharsalus. *Achaeus*: Pompey’s Greek contingents are catalogued at 3.171–97. *Ponticus*: 225–6n. *Assyrius*: possibly ‘eastern’ more generally (*OLD* 1b), but Lucan mentions forces from Assyria at 3.256–7.

**636–7 *cunctos haerere cruores | Romanus campisque uetat consistere torrens*** ‘a torrent of Roman blood prevents all that gore from ceasing to flow and settling on the plain’. *Romanus* . . . *torrens* stands for *torrens sanguinis Romani*; cf. 2.220 *sanguine caeruleum torrenti diuidit aequor*. The hyperbole recalls both the metaphor of 505 *fato torrente* and Caesar’s vision at 292 *uideor fluuios spectare cruoris*.

**638–9 *maius ab hac acie quam quod sua saecula ferrent | uulnus habent populi*** ‘the peoples of the world received a greater wound from this battle than their own generation could bear’. *sua saecula* anticipates 640 *in totum mundi* . . . *aeuum*.

**639–40 *habent . . . est . . . perit***: historic presents (thus *ferrent* in secondary sequence). ***plus est quam uita salusque | quod perit*** explains 638–9, but is itself a paradox requiring a plain explanation at 640. *uita salusque* (again at 5.685) is a Lucretian clausula (Lucr. 4.506), but the two terms are regularly paired in prose and poetry. *salus* can encompass

‘personal safety’ (*OLD* 1a), ‘survival’ (*OLD* 3b), ‘freedom’ (*OLD* 4) and ‘collective security’ (*OLD* 5a).

**640 in totum mundi . . . aeuum** ‘for all the world’s eternity’ (Braund; *OLD* in 23b). **prosternimur** ‘we are utterly defeated’ (*OLD* 5a); also ‘we are prostrated in servitude’ (*OLD* 3b). ‘The shift to the present tense emphasizes the continuing effect of Caesar’s victory in the past’, Quint 1993: 150.

**641 omnis quae seruiet aetas** ‘every generation that will be politically subject’ (*OLD* *seruio* 2): this clause is the subject of *uincitur. seruiet* is ‘answered’ by 643 *in regnum nasci*. The notion of the principate as slavery is developed most fully at 432–45.

**642–3 proxima quid suboles aut quid meruere nepotes | in regnum nasci?** cf. 2.108 (on infants killed in the proscriptions) *crimine quo parui caedem potuere mereri? proxima . . . suboles* ‘the following generation’. *quid . . . quid*: emotive repetition. *nepotes* ‘their descendants’ (*OLD* 3). *in regnum nasci*: enjambment and slow spondees add emphasis.

**643–4 pauide num gessimus arma | teximus aut iugulos?** *pauide* is placed first as the key term. Lines 644–5 make clear that this is a criticism of the courage of those who lost at Pharsalus (picked up by *alieni . . . timoris*); for fear among the Pompeians see 525–7 and 543–4. *num*: demanding a negative answer. *teximus aut iugulos*: in cowardly fashion: cf. Liv. 4.27.11 *tegi magis . . . quam pugnare*; Ov. *Met.* 13.459 (Polyxena) *iugulumque simul pectusque retexit*.

**644–5 alieni poena timoris | in nostra ceruice sedet** ‘The punishment of another’s fear is placed on our neck’ (*OLD* *sedeo* 6). The figurative language might suggest either capital punishment (as at Liv. 31.31.7 *tergo et ceruicibus poenas sociis pendere*) or being shackled (as at Cic. *Ver.* 6.108 *uinctos aspiciunt catenis liberos suos, cum istius auaritiae poenam collo et ceruicibus suis sustinerent*).

**645–6 post proelia natis | si dominum, Fortuna, dabas, et bella dedisses**: the section ends with a brilliant *sententia* sharpened by alliteration, antithesis (*dominum . . . bella*) and the polyptoton *dabas . . . dedisses. dominum*: cf. 1.670 (Figulus) ‘*cum domino pax ista uenit*’. For the appeal to *Fortuna* cf. 1.251–3 (the *Ariminenses*) ‘*melius, Fortuna, dedisses | orbe sub Eoo sedem gelidam sub Arcto | errantesque domos, Latii quam claustra tueri*’. *dabas*: Dilke interprets it as an imperfect of intended action (i.e. *datura eras*), but it is better read as describing continuous action in past time; the conditional clause thus conveys an interpretation of the significance of the battle being narrated: ‘if [in that battle] you were giving a master to later generations’. *dedisses*: jussive (NLS §111).

## 647-697 POMPEY'S FLIGHT

Caesar's account is the most detailed point of comparison: Pompey sees the cavalry routed and, having lost confidence in his army, rides back to his camp. There he encourages the centurions to defend the camp diligently. He declares that he will visit the gates and strengthen their defences but, sceptical of success, he withdraws to his *praetorium* to await the outcome of the battle. When the Caesarians are already inside the camp Pompey removes his general's insignia, flees through the rear gate and rides at a gallop to Larisa (Caes. *Civ.* 3.94.5-6, 3.96.3). Later historical sources differ on minor details (whether he saw the rout or inferred it; whether he rode or walked to his camp). Only Caesar records the exchange with the camp centurions, while Plutarch and Appian lay particular stress on Pompey's mental anguish, which they liken to madness (Plut. *Pomp.* 72.1-2, *Caes.* 45.7-8; App. *BCiv.* 2.81.339; cf. Cass. Dio 42.1.1-2.2). In the extant prose accounts Pompey emerges as deceitful (Caesar), terrified (Cass. Dio), mentally unstable (Plutarch) and cowardly (Caesar, Plutarch and Appian). To Cicero his defeat was utterly disgraceful (*Fam.* 7.3.2 (SB 182) *uictus turpissime amissis etiam castris solus fugit*).

Lucan's account strikes a clear contrast: Pompey thinks his flight will limit casualties (654-8); he frames the escape as sacrificing himself and his family to save the world (660-6); he tries to recall troops from battle (666-9); he would have rushed to his death but he feared that this would inspire more deaths (669-72). Lines 677-89 are almost wholly given over to affirming his equanimity in flight and the passage ends with the statement that his withdrawal only proved the ideological (rather than personal) commitment of his forces (689-97). However, this is by no means a straightforward rehabilitation of Pompey (*pace* Marti 1945). The less noble motive, that he wanted to hide his death from Caesar, is entertained at 673-4, while the elaborate protestations of his selfless courage and equanimity (669-70, 682-9) point the reader to the most trenchant criticism found in the tradition of his flight. Further aspects of the scene invite being read as ironic: Pompey's reasoning at 659-66 is typically self-absorbed; his recalling of troops from dying on his behalf is shown to be misguided and ineffectual at 696-7; his claim not to be worth so great a price at 669 may strike readers as histrionic.

For Leigh (1997a: 115-18) Pompey's flight should be compared with the sequel to a Livian pattern in which an experienced general is dissuaded from a policy of delay and is coerced by subordinates into battle against his better judgment. The closest model within this pattern is Camillus at Satricum in 381 BCE (Liv. 6.23.1, 6.10-12): note especially Camillus' taking up position on a raised mound from where he could

judge the outcome of the ill-advised battle (6.23.12, cf. 649–51n.). The contrast with Pompey's flight is established in the actions of Camillus, who mounts a horse only to rally the routed troops, moves to the foremost standards where the fighting is thickest and turns the course of the battle (6.24.4–7). Further paradigms against which to judge Pompey's flight are Lucan's Curio and Sallust's Catiline (cf. 652–3, 647–51nn.): both point to a normative paradigm of rushing to one's death in similar circumstances. Informing the scene more generally is the ritual of the *devotio*, evoked at 677–9. In this ritual the general dressed in the *cinctus Gabinus* and rode into the enemy seeking a voluntary death. This would consecrate his own life and the lives of the enemy to the gods of the underworld (OCD s.v. '*devotio*'; Oakley 1998: 477–80 on Liv. 8.19–11.1). It is a model of behaviour that is inverted by Pompey's fearless rush to the safety of retreat. See further Marti 1945; Rambaud 1955; Lounsbury 1976: 230–2; Bartsch 1997: 79–82; Leigh 1997a: 115–18; Narducci 2002: 312–19; Cowan 2011: 74–8.

**647–51** Contrast 4.793–8 *Curio, fusas | ut uidit campis acies et cernere tantas | permisit clades compressus sanguine pulvis, | non tulit afflictis animam producere rebus | aut sperare fugam, ceciditque in strage suorum | impiger ad letum et fortis uirtute coacta*; see 647–97n.

**647 transisse** 'transferred their support' (OLD *transeo* 3a) to Caesar; contrary to Pompey's expectations at 349(n.). Cf. Sen. *Ben.* 6.3.1 *egregie mihi uidetur M. Antonius apud Rabirium poetam, cum fortunam suam transeuntem alio uideat et sibi nihil relictum praeter ius mortis, id quoque, si cito occupauerit, exclamare 'hoc habeo, quodcumque dedi'*. Antony's suicide may inform our expectations for Pompey in this context (cf. 652–3n. on *fusa*).

**648 infelix**: cf. 7, 216–17(n.); delayed to the end of the clause for emphasis.

**648–9 tota uix clade coactus | fortunam damnare suam**: cf. 4.269–71 (collective Pompeian *miles*) *tandemque coactus | spe posita damnare fugam casurus in hostes | fertur. tota uix clade coactus* 'reluctantly compelled by the whole disaster'. *damnare* 'to renounce' (OLD 3a; TLL v<sup>1</sup>.17.68–9). He will no longer trust in the favour of *Fortuna*; cf. his apostrophe to her at 666. The two parts of the sentence are balanced by *infelix* and *fortuna*, since *felicitas* was understood as being in *Fortuna*'s gift (Weinstock 1971: 112–27; see too 24n.).

**649–51** Cf. Liv. 6.23.12 (Camillus) *ipse edito loco spectator intentus in euentum alieni consilii constitit*: both generals, coerced into giving battle against their will, witness 'the unwelcome spectacle of their own vindication' (Leigh 1997a: 117, cf. 115–18).



**650–1 *eminus unde omnes sparsas per Thessala rura | aspiceret clades*:** a purpose clause; Pompey's long-range view (*eminus*) stands in contrast with Caesar's activity in the thick of battle (557–85). *clades* may be delayed for effect: Pompey's intention was presumably to get an unobstructed view of *omnes sparsas . . . acies* (or *copias*). *per Thessala rura*: Lucan is fond of using an adjective based on a region + *rura* to denote geographical space (× 9 in *BC*).

**651 *quae bello obstante latebant*:** the general's inability to see the details of battle – often because they are hidden in a cloud of dust (as at 4.765–8, cf. 4.793–4) – was a topos: cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 72.1 'when, from the cloud of dust which he saw, Pompey conjectured the fate of his cavalry'; Cassius at Philippi in 42 was another famous example (App. *BCiv.* 4.113.474; cf. Cass. Dio 47.46.5; Plut. *Brut.* 43); in epic cf. Virg. *A.* 12.444–5 *caeco puluere campus | miscetur*.

**652–3 *tot telis sua fata peti, tot corpora fusa | ac se tam multo pereuntem sanguine uidit*:** contrast 796 (Caesar) *fortunam superosque suos in sanguine cernit*. Pompey identifies with his troops as if he were the very embodiment of his men. As survivor looking back on the collective slaughter of his troops Pompey is cast as an inversion of the 'sacrificial substitute': see Hardie 1993: 54–5 and cf. the wish of Cato to be the 'one' to die for the 'many' at 2.306–19. Note the variation of construction from infinitives to the more vivid present participle (A–G §497 (d)). *uidit* shifts in nuance from 'understood, perceived' (*OLD* 14) in the first clause, to 'saw' (*OLD* 1) in the second, to 'foresaw' (*OLD* 13) in the third (cf. Dilke). *sua fata* 'his own death' (*OLD fata* 6a): the plural for singular is common. *fusa* 'slain' (*OLD* 13b); cf. Sal. *Cat.* 60.7 *Catilina postquam fusas copias seque cum paucis reliquom uidet*; 4.793–4 (quoted at 647–51n.). *tam multo . . . sanguine*: cf. 728–9 (Caesar) *Hesperio uidit . . . arua natare | sanguine*.

**654–5 *nec, sicut mos est miseris, trahere omnia secum | mersa iuuat gentesque suae miscere ruinae*:** these lines declare Pompey's intention not to fight to the last man. The expected manner of ensuring this would be his capitulation, not flight; the laudatory tone here is set to be deflated by his decision to escape; cf. 8.508–9 (Pompey) *et metuit gentes quas uno in sanguine mixtas | deseruit, regesque timet quorum omnia mersit*. *miseris*: not only 'the doomed' (Braund), but 'contemptible men' (*OLD* 4), i.e. those who do not have Pompey's *magnanimitas* (cf. his *ingentes animae* at 679, 8.28). *trahere omnia secum | mersa* 'to drag down everything and plunge it into ruins with him'. *mersa* is the equivalent of a coordinate clause, i.e. *mergere omnia et trahere secum* (A–G §496 n. 2); for its sense (*OLD* 10b) cf. 1.159 *semina, quae populos semper mersere potentes. gentesque suae miscere ruinae* 'and to embroil the whole world in his own downfall' (*OLD gens* 2a, *misceo* 6a);



cf. 8.324–5 (Pompey's plan to seek Parthian help and thereby) '*tantam consumere gentem | et nostris miscere malis*', 9.33 (the Pompeian remnants) *Emathiae . . . fragmenta ruinae*.

**656–8** I print Heinsius' *fouitque* for **Ω** *uouitque* and read *ut . . . uiuat* as a substantive clause in apposition to *uotis* (cf. A–G §560–2). Even though Lucan is sometimes unconcerned about the close repetition of words ('almost insensible', Housman xxxiii), *uouitque* is unconvincing so soon after *uotis*: the two words in such close proximity would be unique in the poem. Housman accepted *uouitque* and repunctuated to make line 656 its indirect command, but this creates a very awkward interruption between the command and its verb. Amending **Ω** *uouitque* also obviates any perceived need to put line 656 after 658 (argued for by Hudson-Williams 1954: 190–1). With the reading *fouitque*, the substantive clause is emphasized by anticipating *uotis* and it is made vivid by the present tense of *uiuat* after a main verb in secondary sequence (A–G §485 (c)). *fouitque* gives good sense and is orthographically closer to **Ω** *uouitque* than Shackleton Bailey's (1982: 97) attractive suggestion *habuitque*; it may lie behind Ausonius, *Parentalia* 4.24 *dicebas sed te solacia longa fouere*.

**656** *ut Latiae post se uiuat pars maxima turbae*: the prospective prayer is pointedly dashed at 844–5 *Latiae pars maxima turbae | fastidita iacet*; cf. 47–8n.

**657** *sustinuit* 'he did not cease' (*OLD* 6). **dignos . . . uotis**: i.e. they might be receptive to his prayer (*Comm. Bern.*: *apud quos uota fierent*). The phrase may further suggest that Pompey still deems them deserving of prayer even after their failure of him. On human reactions to divine indifference in *BC* see the Introduction, section 3.

**658** *caelicolas*: an old, poetic compound (× 4 in *BC*) dignifies Pompey's faith. **fouitque sui solacia casus** 'and cherished this as consolation for his calamity'; cf. Virg. *A.* 6.377 *duri solacia casus*.

**659** *parcite* 'refrain from' + inf. (*OLD* 2c); more commonly used in the sense 'be merciful, spare' (*OLD* 3) in prayers. **prosternere**: cf. 278 (Caesar) '*primo ferri motu prosternite mundum*'; see also 534–5n.

**660** *stante . . . mundo Romaque superstite* 'with the world yet enduring and Rome surviving'; ablative absolute, arranged in chiasmus of nouns and modifiers. For Lucan's habit of describing the war and its consequences as universal catastrophes see 1.72–80 with Roche; in *BC* 7 see e.g. 91–2n., 134–7, 244, 654–5; Lapidge 1979.

**660–1** *Magnus | esse miser*: alliteration and emphatic enjambment neatly map Pompey's fall from greatness to humility. The predicate *esse*

*miser* swerves away from the expected antithesis of *stante* and *superstite mori* (or *sim.*).

**661 mea** ‘inflicted on me’ (*OLD* 4). **coniunx**: Pompey had left Cornelia on Lesbos at 5.722–815 and they will be reunited at 8.40–158. She will play a more prominent role in book 8 and the beginning of 9. On her role in the poem see Bruère 1951a; Ahl 1976: 173–83; Sannicandro 2010: 43–79.

**662 nati**: Cn. Pompeius Magnus, his eldest son, was defeated by Caesar’s forces at Munda in 45. In *BC* Pompey orders him to go east and gather forces for him at 2.630–49. He learns of Pompey’s fate from his brother in Libya at 9.120–44; after this he urges a punitive expedition against Ptolemy (9.145–66). Lucan is the only source to attribute a role in the civil war to Pompey’s younger son, Sex. Pompeius Magnus, whom he characterizes as *Magno proles indigna parente* (6.420). He is placed in Pompey’s forces in Thessaly, where he consults Erictho (6.419–37, 6.570–830). He will witness Pompey’s death at 8.632–3 and report this to his brother. **pignora** ‘hostages’ (*OLD* 1b). Family members frequently guaranteed treaties between nations (e.g. Aug. *Anc.* 32 (the Parthian king) *amicitiam nostram per liberorum suorum pignora petens*; Liv. 2.13.9 (of Cloelia) *Romani pignus pacis ex foedere restituerunt*). The word was also very commonly used of immediate family, especially children (*OLD* 4; *TLL* x'.2125.33–71). *dedimus tot pignora fati* is the origin of the English proverb ‘to give hostages to fortune’ (first in Bacon’s ‘Of Marriage and Single Life’, 1612).

**663 parum est** ‘is it insufficient’ (*OLD* 2a). **meque meosque**: 30n.

**664 obruit** ‘overwhelm’ (*OLD* 4a): an emotive word, highlighted by enjambment before a sense pause. **exiguae clades** ‘a trivial disaster’ (*OLD* *exigua* 6a), juxtaposition sharpens the paradox. Both *parum* and *exiguae* may contrast with *Magnus*: cf. 2.708 *exigua est fugiens uictoria Magnus*. *TLL* (III.1242.54–5) is wrong to suggest that *clades* means ‘the remains of the defeat’. **orbe remoto**: ablative absolute with conditional force; cf. 671–2.

**665** Pompey emotively asks the same question twice, with alliteration, repetition and variation (*omnia . . . cuncta*). For *lacerare* of countries, nations or people cf. *TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.826.10–33; Sen. *Dial.* 1.4.12 *uerberat nos et lacerat fortuna; patiamur!*

**666 iam nihil est, Fortuna, meum?** ‘Is nothing now in my power, Fortune?’ (*OLD* *meus* 7a). This sentence is better punctuated as a question to avoid an insipid concluding statement that contradicts 661–2 (Shackleton Bailey 1987: 86–7). **sic fatur**: a common formula in epic

to introduce or conclude direct speech (cf. Hom. *Od.* 6.223 ὦς ἔφαθ'; Virg. *A.* 6.1 *sic fatur lacrimans*). **arma** 'the troops' (*OLD* 7a).

**667 afflicta omni iam parte** 'overthrown now on every side' (*OLD* affligo 5b; cf. Liv. 3.8.11 *Volsci Aequique afflicta vires suas in unum contulere*). For *omni* . . . *parte* of being attacked on all sides cf. Liv. 23.46.2 *cum omni parte pellerentur* (*TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.480.31). **cateruas**: see 337–8n.

**668 circumit** 'goes the round of' (*OLD* 6a). **matura in fata ruentes**: cf. Sen. *Oed.* 72–3 *matura poscens fata, praecurram ut prior | patriam ruentem*. Pompey's soldiers perform the self-sacrifice incumbent upon him. *matura* 'imminent' (cf. *OLD* 7c; *TLL* VIII.501.54–62), not 'before their time' (Dilke).

**669 seque negat tanti**: *tanti*: genitive of value (and a pun on Pompey's name). It is typical of Pompey's self-absorption that he interprets the actions of his soldiers as being motivated by loyalty to himself rather than the cause for which they fight: his view is made explicit at 671–2. The issue of the devotion of the Pompeians to the republican cause as opposed to personal loyalty for Pompey is raised repeatedly: e.g. 2.322–3 (Cato) '*me milite uincat | ne sibi se uicisse putet*', 5.13–14 *docuit populos uenerabilis ordo | non Magni partes sed Magnum in partibus esse*, 7.696–7 *teque inde fugato | ostendit moriens sibi se pugnas senatus*, 9.29–30 *totae post Magni funera partes | libertatis erant*. **nec derat robur**: the key, apologetic words in defence of Pompey's resolve (*OLD* robur 10) come first for emphasis. 'Blame denied reveals the suspicion which the denial controverts, gives air to the notion that Pompey's generalship was perhaps cowardly or his conduct reprehensible', Leigh 1997a: 82.

**669–70 in enses | ire**: cf. Virg. *A.* 9.400–1 (Nisus contemplating death or flight) *an sese medios moriturus in enses | inferat et pulchram properet per uulnera mortem?* For the phrase *ire in enses* cf. Sen. *Her. O.* 444, *Med.* 593–4.

**670 iuguloque pati uel pectore letum**: honourable wounds in the front of the body. The poetic *letum* (599–600n.) ennobles the sentiment.

**671–2 sed timuit, strato miles ne corpore Magni | non fugeret, supraque ducem procumberet orbis**: cf. 117–19n. *sed*: 673n. *strato* . . . *corpore Magni*: ablative absolute with conditional force; *strato* 'stretched lifeless' (*OLD* 7a). *miles*: collective singular. *non fugeret*: enjambed for emphasis. *supraque ducem procumberet orbis*: a hyperbole suggesting gigantic proportions for Pompey (Gagliardi).

**673 aut**: if 671 *sed* is correct (**ZMU**, **V** in erasure; *aut* **PG**), what was a confident assertion at 671–2 is without warning radically undercut by the

suggestion of another, less noble instinct on Pompey's part. **subducere** 'to remove from view' (*OLD* 7b).

**674 nequiquam, infelix:** the futility of Pompey's desire is expressed as simply and as directly as possible, in direct apostrophe by the narrator who speaks as one who is privy to future events; for apostrophe in *BC* see the Introduction, section 10 and 23n. *infelix*: cf. 7, 216–17nn.

**674–5** Caesar will view Pompey's severed head at 9.1032–46; the inescapability of an historical event is presented by the narrator in terms which imply the irresistibility of Caesar's will. Attention to Caesar's gaze will become a more prominent theme from line 728.

**674 socero:** 53n. **uolenti:** the present participle may be taken with temporal force (A–G §496) or may imply the protasis of a conditional clause (A–G §521 (a)).

**675 ubicumque** 'wherever that may be' (*OLD* 2b). **coniunx:** the narrator apostrophizes Cornelia directly; for Cornelia cf. 661n.

**676 causa fugae:** sc. *eras*. **uultusque tui:** the genitive of the pronoun instead of the possessive adjective *tuus* to express possession (A–G §302 (a)).

**676–7 fatisque negatum | parte absente mori** 'and that it had been refused by the fates that he die with part of himself elsewhere': *negatum* (*esse*), an impersonal infinitive (with dative of agent), takes the infinitive *mori* as its subject; cf. 1.70–1 *summisque negatum | stare diu*. The notion is that Pompey would have preferred to spare Cornelia the sight of his death, but the fates denied him this. *parte absente*: ablative absolute. This is Housman's conjecture for **Ω** *te praesente*, which is contrary to the logic required. The fates did not refuse that Pompey die with Cornelia present: cf. e.g. 8.632 *uidet hanc Cornelia caedem*. See further Housman's note *ad loc*. For *pars* affectionately denoting one's spouse cf. esp. 5.756–9 (Pompey speaks) '*si numina nostras | impulerint acies, maneat pars optima Magni, | sitque mihi, si fata prement uictorque cruentus, | quo fugisse uelim*' (further examples at *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.466.68–72). Anderson 1927: 30 and Mayer 1979: 349–50 caution that *pars* in this sense would be unqualified only here, but as SB suggests, an epithet (e.g. *eius* or *optima*) is easily understood, as at *Ov. Met.* 11.473 *quae pars admonet absit* (also a story of conjugal loyalty).

**677–9 tum Magnum concitus aufert | a bello sonipes non tergo tela paudentem | ingentesque animos extrema in fata ferentem:** cf. *Caes. Civ.* 3.96.3 *Pompeius, iam cum intra uallum nostri uersarentur, equum nactus, detractis insignibus imperatoris, decumana porta se ex castris eiecit protinusque equo citato Larisam contendit. concitus* 'spurred to a gallop' (cf. *OLD* *concieo*

1a; *TLL* iv.38.11–12). *concitus aufert*: the line ending may recall for the reader the contrasting actions of Virgil's Tarchon: *A.* 11.741–4 *equum in medios moriturus et ipse | concitat, et Venulo aduersum se turbidus infert | dereptumque ab equo dextra complectitur hostem | et gremium ante suum multa ui concitus aufert*. *sonipes*: a poetic word for horse, perhaps ennobling or adding irony to Pompey's escape. *non tergo tela pauentem*: contrast 8.5–8 *pauet ille fragorem | motorum uentis nemorum, comitumque suorum | qui post terga redit trepidum laterique timentem | exanimat. ingentesque animos* 'great courage' (*OLD* *animus* 7b), more play on 'Magnus'; cf. 8.27–9 (of Pompey) *sic longius aeuum | destruit ingentes animos et uita superstes | imperio*. *-que* 'but' joins a positive to a negative clause (*OLD* 6b). For the laudatory tone in which Pompey's flight is described see 654–5n. *extrema in fata*: cf. *Virg. A.* 9.204 (Euryalus) *fata extrema secutus* (with Hardie's note), 8.652–3 (Cornelia) *'te fata extrema petente | uita digna fui?'* *extrema* 'final'; one may also hear the secondary meaning 'remotest' (cf. *OLD* 1c) and a hint at Pompey's incipient exile and death on a foreign shore.

**680 non gemitus, non fletus**: as during his assassination: 8.616–17 *ne . . . | uellet . . . aeternam fletu corrumpere famam*, 8.619 *nullo gemitu consensit ad ictum*.

**680–1 saluaque uerendus | maiestate dolor** 'but awe-inspiring grief with majesty preserved'; (*OLD* *-que* 6a); cf. 378 (Pompey would grovel before Caesar) *imperii salua si maiestate liceret*, 4.340–1 (Afranius) *seruata precanti | maiestas non fracta malis*; here *maiestate* is marked as a pun on Pompey's name by the apostrophe *Magne*.

**681–2 qualem te, Magne, decebat | Romanis praestare malis** 'such as it was proper for you, Magnus, to offer to Roman evils' (*OLD* *praesto* 6b; *TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.916.18–32); cf. *Sen. Dial.* 11.5.1 *nulli minus gratum esse dolorem tuum quam ei, cui praestari uidetur*. The construction has the effect of personifying *Romanis . . . malis*.

**682 non impare uultu** 'with an unshakable expression' (litotes; cf. *OLD* *impar* 6); cf. *Hor. Carm.* 1.37.25–6 (Cleopatra) *ausa et iacentem uisere regiam | uultu sereno* with N–H, who draw attention to the praise of the unchanged expression in philosophical works and adduce *Cic. Tusc.* 3.31 *hic est enim ille uultus semper idem . . . ea frons tranquilla et serena . . . semper idem uultus, cum mentis, a qua is fingitur, nulla fieret mutatio*. Contrast Caesar's positively joyful gaze at 794–5 *uiuat Emathiam non cernere terram | et lustrare oculis campos sub clade latentes*.

**683–4** These lines recall the summative rhetoric of a death notice, as at 2.131–3 *ille fuit uitae Mario modus, omnia passo | quae peior fortuna potest, atque omnibus uso | quae melior*. Cf. also Pompey's soliloquy as he dies at

8.625–7 ‘*fata tibi longae fluxerunt prospera uitae: | ignorant populi, si non in morte probaris, | an scieris aduersa pati*’. The expression of Pompey’s steadfastness of spirit is sharpened by polyptoton and chiasmus (both of verbs and adjectives, and of verbs and subjects), and elevated in register by the construction *prospera bellorum* . . . *aduersa* (neuter adjectives as subject + adnominal gen.; cf. 107–8n.). *uidere* . . . *uidebunt* ‘saw . . . will see (in a particular state)’ (OLD 8), gently personifying *prospera* and *aduersa* as subjects.

**685–6** *quamque fuit laeto per tres infida triumphos | tam misero Fortuna minor* ‘and as inferior as treacherous Fortune was to you (then) in your happiness, during the period of your three triumphs, so she is (now) in your wretched state’ (OLD *per* 6b, *minor* 6a). *laeto* . . . *misero*: supply *te* (ablatives of comparison with *minor*). *infida*: cf. Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.143–4 *infida leuisque* | . . . *Fortuna*; the epithet’s placement within the phrase *per tres* . . . *triumphos* may hint at her potential to betray the trust of her favourites even at the height of their success. For various expressions denoting her proverbial fickleness see Otto 1890: 142–3 (‘*fortuna*’ 5). For Pompey’s triumphs see 14n.

**686–7** *iam pondere fati | deposito securus abi*: *iam* ‘now’ marks a new action after 683 *aspicis* but may also imply ‘already’ taken with any of *deposito*, *securus* or *abi*: i.e. with surprising swiftness (OLD 4a). *pondere fati* | *deposito* ‘the burden of destiny having been laid down’ (OLD *pondus* 5c; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 5.534 (Opheltes’ death) *tam magni pondera fati*). The phrase describes Pompey’s equanimity in the face of disaster: cf. Sen. *Ben.* 5.3.2 *nemo trecentos Fabios uictos dicit, sed occisos; et Regulus captus est a Poenis, non uictus, et quisquis alius saeuientis fortunae ui ac pondere oppressus non submittit animum*. The irony is that this equanimity carries Pompey away from a heroic death on the battlefield. For *fatum* so soon after *fortuna* (686) see 504–5n. *securus abis*: cf. 612–13 (Domitius) ‘*liber ad umbras | et securus eo*’ (with note). The reading *abis* APGV (*abit* ZMU) conforms to the second person used 681–6 and at 689–91.

**687–8** *nunc tempora laeta | respexisse uacat*: cf. 20 *anxia mens curis ad tempora laeta refugit*. Instead of literally looking back to the battlefield, Pompey figuratively looks back (OLD *respicio* 5) into his own past (cf. 20n.). *respexisse*: equivalent to a present infinitive (617–18n.). *uacat* ‘there is scope’.

**688** *spes numquam implenda recessit* ‘(since) hope has withdrawn, never to be fulfilled’ (OLD *impleo* 10a); parataxis obscures the causal nuance of this sentence. Seneca treats hope as an impediment to memory at *Ben.* 3.4.2 *memoriae minimum tribuit, quisquis spei plurimum*.

**689 quid fueris nunc scire licet:** it is left to the reader to ponder the precise nature of Pompey's revelation. Feeney 1986b: 240 interprets this self-knowledge as the beginning of Pompey's emancipation from his past. Day 2013: 218 lays stress upon the phrase as highlighting a moment of rupture: "What Pompey was" (*quid fueris*) has been severed by Pharsalus from his present self. His former life is lost forever, all hope (of victory and, consequently, of a return to the past) vanished. Pompey has become *infelix*; his *tempora laeta* are no longer a state of being, but have instead become, as Ankersmit puts it, "an object of knowledge".

**689 fuge proelia dira:** adapted at Sil. 9.175 *fuge proelia Varro*.

**689–90 dira | . . . deos:** perhaps hinting at the etymology *dirus* < *dei ira* (Maltby 1991: s.v. 'dirus').

**690 testare deos** 'call the godswitness' (with acc. + inf.). **nullum:** i.e. *neminem* (*OLD nullus* 2a). **qui perstet in armis:** a relative clause in indirect speech, hence the subjunctive mood.

**691 iam tibi, Magne, mori:** cf. 671–2. **flebilis Africa damnis:** i.e. Thapsus in 46. Its 'losses' (*OLD damnum* 2c) comprised up to 50,000 of the republican forces, Juba I, Metellus Scipio and Cato the Younger, who committed suicide at Utica upon hearing of the defeat (*B. Afr.* 79–86; *Plut. Cat. Min.* 58.13, *Caes.* 53; *App. BCiv.* 2.96.401–100.417; *Cass. Dio* 43.7.1–9.3). *flebilis* 'worthy of tears', as at 871 *flebilis unda Pachyni*.

**692 Munda nocens:** cf. 1.40 *funesta . . . Munda*. In 45 at Munda in Spain, Caesar defeated republican forces under the command of Labienus and Gnaeus Pompey. Thirty thousand republican casualties are recorded (*B. Hisp.* 31.9; *Plut. Caes.* 56.3). Labienus died, Gnaeus Pompey was killed in flight (*B. Hisp.* 32.4, 39.2; *Cass. Dio* 45.40.1–2; *App. BCiv.* 2.105.435–6). **Pharioque a gurgite clades** 'the disaster by the Pharian waters' (*OLD ab* 23b, *gurgis* 2): the fighting between Caesar and the Alexandrians in 48–47, which Lucan treats as a civil war (cf. 10.402–21, esp. 10.410–11) and with which Lucan's (and Caesar's) narrative breaks off (10.398–546; *Caes. Civ.* 3.111–12; *B. Alex.* 1–33). Pharos was an island north of Alexandria, famous for its lighthouse (Barrington 74B2).

**693–6** 'so too, after you, the most important factor in the Thessalian battle will no longer be the name of Pompey – as famous throughout the world as it is – nor enthusiasm for war, but the pair of adversaries that we always have, Liberty and Caesar' (*OLD pars* 5e, *par*<sup>s</sup> 1d). *pars maxima* is the subject of the sentence, while *nomen*, *studium*, *par* and *Libertas et Caesar* are predicate nominatives. The future tense of *erit* marks the narrator looking forward from Pharsalus to his own time, which is represented in the present tense of *habemus*.



**693 post te:** i.e. *post te profugum* (Housman on 5.473 gives further examples of this construction). This phrase is re-echoed to Pompey at 9.108 (Cornelia) ‘*turpe mori post te solo non posse dolore*’, 9.242–3 (a republican soldier) ‘*te solum in bella secutus | post te fata sequar*’ and 10.7–8 (narrator) *tui socerum rapuere a sanguine manes, | ne populus post te Nilum Romanus amaret*. **pars maxima:** a pun on ‘Magnus’. This phrase does not mean ‘the majority’ or sim. (Dilke, Braund): cf. Gal. frag. 2.3 Courtney *maxima Romanae pars eris> historiae* (with Anderson, Parsons and Nisbet 1979: 140–1). Lucan does not (*pace* Dilke) misrepresent the length of time elapsing between Pompey’s flight and the end of the fighting (cf. 728–31): this is immaterial to his point.

**694 Pompei nomen:** i.e. ‘Magnus’, marking the pun *pars maxima*. **populare per orbem:** implicitly concessive.

**695–6 sed par quod semper habemus, | Libertas et Caesar:** cf. 580 (the senate) *libertas ultima mundi*, 9.29–30 *totae post Magni funera partes | libertatis erant*. Lucan has collapsed two distinct meanings of *libertas*: (i) republicanism, i.e. ‘the preservation of collective rule by the elite without domination by any one individual’ (Oakley 2009b: 185): this is what his protagonists fight to preserve within his poem; and (ii) ‘freedom of action’ (ibid.), i.e. the preservation of individual civic rights under an autocrat, the most relevant nuance of the word for Lucan’s own generation of aristocrats. The image of a perpetual struggle is a more optimistic evaluation of the principate than that of the perpetual self-imposed exile of *Libertas* described at 432–6 or the narrator’s interjection at 638–46 (cf. Quint 1993: 147–51). On *libertas* in the early empire see Wirszubski 1968: 124–71; Oakley 2009b: 184–94. *par*, a gladiatorial term, is one of the poem’s most important words, offering the prospect of an equal match in a poem of lopsided encounters (cf. 1.129 *nec coiere pares*) and protagonists to whom parity is anathema (1.125–6 *nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarue priorem | Pompeiusue parem*); it evokes the notion of a viewing audience (here in the first-person plural subject of *habemus*), so important to its ethos (Leigh 1997a). The metaphor develops from the proem (1.7 *pares aquilas et pila minantia pilis*) and is often activated through words such as *par*, *harena* and *munus*, the notion of spectatorship, and by explicit comparisons (such as 4.285–91, 4.708–10).

**696–7 teque inde fugato | ostendit moriens sibi se pugnasse senatus:** countering Pompey’s belief that his flight would only result in a meaningless slaughter (cf. 666–72, esp. 669 *seque negat tanti*). Conspicuous assonance and alliteration add emphasis and bring the section to a close. For the sentiment cf. 5.13–14 *docuit populos uenerabilis ordo | non Magni partes sed Magnum in partibus esse*, 9.259 (Cato) ‘*tibi, non ducibus, uiuis morerisque*’.



## 698–711 AN APOSTROPHE TO POMPEY

698–711: *It is a good thing to have been defeated and to flee the battle; pity Caesar for his victory.* 703–7: *No matter what happens to you now, you are better off, because in a civil war it is worse to win.* 709–11: *Forbid any lamentation: go forth serenely to the lands that you once conquered and choose a place to die.*

**698–9 nonne iuuat pulsum bellis cessisse nec istud | perspectasse nefas?** The subject infinitives of *iuuat* gain emphasis by the assonance of metrically stressed syllables (<sup>l</sup>-līs ces<sup>s</sup>isse nec <sup>l</sup>ístud | . . . <sup>l</sup>tásse ne<sup>l</sup> fās). *pulsum* (sc. *te*) ‘defeated’ (*OLD* 5; cf. Virg. *A.* 11.366 (Drances to Turnus) ‘*pone animos et pulsus abi*’). *perspectasse* ‘to have watched through to the end’ (*OLD* 2). *nefas*: 122–3n.

**699–700 spumantes caede cateruas | respice, turbatos incursu sanguinis amnes:** cf. Virg. *A.* 9.455–6 *tepidaque recentem | caede locum et pleno spumantes sanguine riuos* (Lucan’s transferred epithet *spumantes caede cateruas* may reflect the hypallage of this passage: see Hardie *ad loc.*). *spumantes caede*: cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.96–7 *recenti | caede leaena boum spumantes oblita rictus. respice* (687–8n.) ‘look back upon’ (*OLD* 2a); perhaps also suggesting ‘show concern for’ (*OLD* 8a). *turbatos*: as a result of the volume of blood; the line slows over the detail (*tūrbātōs incūrsū*); for bloodied rivers see 116n.

**701 soceri miserere tui:** a paradox explained at 706 *uincere peius erat*; cf. 53n.

**701 quo pectore:** i.e. with what emotions or sense of morality (*OLD* *pectus* 3a).

**701–2 Romam | intrabit:** Caesar had last entered Rome on 31 March 49 (3.98), he would next enter the city on 25 July 47 (*B. Afr.* 98).

**702 factus campis felicior istis:** for *felix* used of military success see *TLL* VI.442.39–53. *felicior* may be understood with Pompey as its point of reference (i.e. *quam tu*) or more generally denoting an increase in his fortune. *istis*: without reference to the second person (*OLD* 4).

**703 in ignotis solus regionibus exul:** supply *patiere* from 704. Cf. 379 (Pompey) ‘*Magnus, nisi uincitis, exul*’, 8.208–9 *terrarum dominos et sceptrā Eoa tenentes | exul habet comites*, 8.837 *exul adhuc iacet umbra ducis*. Pompey is first called an exile when he abandons Italy at 2.728–30. Dilke interprets *in ignotis . . . regionibus* as a reference to Pompey’s unrealized plan to go to Parthia for help. This counterfactual interpretation is unlikely: the indicative mood of *quidquid . . . patiere* ‘whatever you will suffer’ and the allusion to events that actually took place in 704 suggest that the phrase is rather a characteristic hyperbole describing Pompey’s ‘wanderings’ in book 8.

**704 sub Phario positus . . . tyranno** ‘subject to the Pharian tyrant’ (*OLD* *pono* 11a; *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.2658.11–14). The periphrasis describes Ptolemy XIII (as at e.g. 8.556, 8.574).

**705 crede deis, longo fatorum crede fauori** ‘answers’ 703–5 and anticipates 706. Repetition and asyndeton draw attention to the narrator’s puzzling advice to have confidence in the gods and fate (*OLD* *credo* 3) when we have been told that both are no longer on Pompey’s side (646–7 *iam Magnus transisse deos Romanaque fata | senserat infelix*).

**706 uincere peius erat:** a crisp *sententia* absolves Pompey, gives point to the advice of 703–5, and encapsulates one of the poem’s fundamental ethical paradoxes. **prohibe lamenta sonare** ‘restrain the laments from resounding’ (*OLD* *prohibeo* 7b).

**707 remitte** ‘abandon’ (*OLD* 10).

**708 mundus adoret** ‘let the world revere’. The language of venerating Pompey is developed in book 8: cf. 8.114–15 (the Mytilenian crowd, asking Pompey to sleep in the city) ‘*fac, Magne, locum, quem cuncta reuisant | saecula, quem ueniens hospes Romanus adoret*’ and 8.835–72 (esp. 841 *sacris dignam . . . umbram*, 850 *summusque feret tua busta sacerdos*, 860 *nunc est pro numine summo*).

**709–10 aspice securus uultu non supplice reges, | aspice possessas urbes donataque regna:** anaphora, asyndeton, identical metre (DSSS) and the *figura etymologica* *regna* < *reges* enhance the variation of 709. *aspice:* cf. 682–3 *non impare uultu | aspicias Emathiam*. **securus:** cf. 687 *securus abis*. *possessas urbes donataque regna:* in his own estimate he had subdued 1,538 towns or forts (*oppidis castellis*) during his eastern campaign (Plin. *Nat.* 7.97).

**711 Aegypton Libyamque:** in apposition to 710 *donataque regna* (*Aegypton* is a Greek accusative form). Pompey’s third option, Parthia, had never been in his gift and so is not listed (cf. 8.277 *Libyam Parthosque Pharonque*). In book 5, the senate under Pompey’s newly confirmed leadership recognized Ptolemy’s authority in Egypt (5.58–64) and Juba as king of Libya (5.56–7); Pompey had reinstated Juba’s father Hiempsal in his kingdom (Plut. *Pomp.* 12.4). **terras:** plural for singular. **morti:** dative of purpose; a surprise end to a sentence which could as easily have been leading to his gathering of new forces.

## 712–727 POMPEY AT LARISA

Cf. Val. Max. 4.5.5 *Pompeius autem Magnus Pharsalica acie uictus a Caesare, cum postero die Larisam intraret, oppidique illius uniuersus populus obuiam ei processisset, 'ite' inquit 'et istud officium praestate uictori.' dicerem non dignus qui uinceretur, nisi a Caesare esset superatus; certe modestus in calamitate: nam quia dignitate sua uti iam non poterat, usus est uerecundia.*

**712 uidit . . . testis:** cf. 8.18–19 *grauis est Magno quicumque malorum | testis adest.* **Larisa:** cf. Caes. Civ. 3.96.3 *protinusque equo citato Larisam contendit.* It was the chief city of Thessaly, c. 40 km north of modern Farsala (Barrington 55C1). Plutarch records that he went from Larisa to the sea via Tempe (*Pomp.* 73.3).

**713 nobile** ‘heroic’ (*OLD* 6).

**713–15 omnibus illa | ciuibus effudit totas per moenia uires | obuia ceu laeto:** Cass. Dio 42.2.2 records that Pompey did not enter the city in case it incurred some penalty for receiving him. In antiquity it was common for people to flood out of a city to meet a great personage. The practice was normal for a victorious general but paradoxical for one who had just suffered defeat: see Oakley on Liv. 9.6.7. *omnibus . . . | ciuibus:* ablative of instrument with *effudit*. *effudit totas . . . uires:* cf. 344 (Caesar) ‘*totas effundite uires*’. *per moenia* ‘through her walls’, i.e. through the gates in the walls: cf. Val. Max. 4.5.5 *populus obuiam ei processisset* (712–27n.), but the striking synecdoche *moenia* for *fores* (by which the people seem to smash through the city walls) is difficult to parallel. The phrase *per moenia/per muros* more commonly means ‘along the walls’ (with *disponere* or sim.), or ‘throughout the city’ (as at Virg. A. 2.252, 2.705, 4.75). **obuia** ‘so as to meet’ agrees with *illa* (Larisa) and gives purpose to *effudit* (*OLD* *obuius* 1b).

**715 munera:** probably ‘gifts’ in view of the latter scene at Mytilene 8.121–3 ‘*accipe templorum cultus aurumque deorum; | accipe, si terris, si puppibus ista inuentus | aptior est; tota, quantum ualet, utere Lesbo*’; the word can also mean ‘military service’ (*OLD* 2a).

**716 pandunt templa, domos:** for Pompey to use the resources within. **socios se cladibus optant** ‘they wish to be allies in your defeat’; cf. 2.346–7 (Marcia to Cato) ‘*non me laetorum sociam rebusque secundis | accipis: in curas uenio partemque laborum*’.

**717–19** Pompey’s immense fame is a burden to him at 8.19–21 *cunctis ignotus gentibus esse | mallet et obscuro tutus transire per urbes | nomine.*

**717 scilicet** ‘evidently’ (*OLD* 3a), based on the behaviour of the Larisans at 713-16. **immenso . . . ex nomine** ‘an immeasurably great name’ (*OLD immensus* 3a), punning on ‘Magnus’ (on Pompey’s name see 7, 22nn.).

**718 teque minor solo:** continuing the wordplay on ‘Magnus’; he is paradoxically inferior only to his own former standing and to no other.

**718-19 cunctas impellere gentes | rursus in arma potes rursusque in fata redire:** cf. 1.68-9 *quid in arma furem | impulerit populum*; anaphora, alliteration, assonance and repetition add emphasis and suggest urgency. *potes* takes both *impellere* and *redire* as prolative infinitives. *in fata* ‘to your destiny’ (*OLD fatum* 3a).

**720-1** Note the change of person from second to third.

**721 praestate fidem** ‘prove your loyalty’ (*OLD praesto* 11b); cf. Val. Max. 4.5.5 *officium praestate uictori* (712-27n.).

**721-2 tu, Caesar, in alto | caedis adhuc cumulo patriae per uiscera uadis:** cf. Virg. A. 6.833 (Anchises to Caesar and Pompey) ‘*neu patriae ualidas in uiscera uertite uires*’. The apostrophe is made vivid by alliteration and assonance. *Caesar . . . caedis* may hint at the etymology *Caesar* < *caedo* (‘Caesar’s very name is *Slaughter*’, Morgan 1999: 134).

**722 caedis . . . cumulo:** cf. 597-8 *iacet aggere magno | patricium campis non mixta plebe cadauer*, 790-1 (*cernit*) *excelsos cumulis aequantia colles | corpora*. Heaps or mounds of the dead feature very prominently in the poem: cf. 2.160-1 *colla ducum . . . medio congesta foro*, 2.209-10 *congesta . . . | omnia . . . cadauera*, 4.570-1 *strage cruenta | . . . cumulata ratis*, 6.153-4 (Scaeva) ‘*cumulo uos desse uirorum | non pudet . . . ?*’, 6.180-1 *cumulo crescente cadauera murum | admouere solo* (cf. 10.540 *non acie fusa nec magnae stragis aceruis*). With the phrase *caedis cumulus* (first found in Luc.) cf. Lucr. 3.70-1 *sanguine civili rem conflant diuitiasque | conduplicant auidi, caedem caede accumulantes*. **patriae per uiscera:** 579-81n.

**723 gener** (53n.) ironically suggests the *fides* of a son-in-law towards his father-in-law.

**724 sonipes:** 677-9n. **gemitus lacrimaeque sequuntur:** cf. the send-off for Pompey and Cornelia as they leave Mytilene at 8.148-53.

**725 plurimaque in saeuos populi conuicia diuos:** cf. 2.44 (men leaving Rome for the opposing camps) *effundunt iustas in numina saeua querellas*, 9.186-7 *non tamen ad Magni peruenit gratius umbras | omne quod in superos audet conuicia uulgus. in saeuos . . . diuos*: focalized through the Larisans, since the substance of their ‘reproofs’ against the gods will have been that

they were *saeui* (as at 3.742–3 ‘*non perdam tempora*’ dixit | ‘*a saeuis permissa deis* . . .’).

**726–7 uera fides quaesiti . . . fauoris | contigit ac fructus** ‘the true proof and enjoyment of the popular favour you sought’ (for Pompey’s desire for popular favour see 9–24). For *fides* cf. 1.524 *fati peioris manifesta fides*; for Lucan’s phrase (with *fides* in the sense ‘fulfilment’) cf. Prop. 4.1b.98 *uera, sed inuito, contigit ista fides. quaesiti . . . fauoris*. cf. 1.131–3 *famaeque petitor | multa dare in uulgus, totus popularibus auris | impelli plausuque sui gaudere theatri*.

**727 felix se nescit amari** ‘the successful man does not know that he is loved’, i.e. ‘is never certain he is loved for himself’ (adapting Duff). The Larisans’ grief for Pompey in his defeat shows him that their love is genuine; he is not so certain that this is the meaning of Cornelia’s grief at 8.84–5 ‘*uiuuit post proelia Magnus | sed fortuna perit. quod defles, illud amasti?*’. This paradoxical gnomic *sententia* ends the passage and concludes Lucan’s attention to Pompey in book 7.

## 728–760 POMPEY’S CAMP

Caesar’s order to spare fellow citizens during the rout (a celebrated detail: Vell. 2.52.4; Suet. *Jul.* 75.2; Florus 2.13.50; App. *BCiv.* 2.80.336–8) is passed over quickly in order to focus attention on Pompey’s camp. At 731–6 Lucan preserves the rationale found in Caesar (3.95.1–2) and Appian (2.81) that the camp was taken to prevent the Pompeians from regrouping, but omits to narrate any further Pompeian defence (cf. the foreign auxiliaries at Caes. *Civ.* 3.93.3). At Caes. *Civ.* 3.96.1 the exotic luxury items discovered in the camp betray the Pompeians as an orientalized ‘other’ and give evidence of their avarice and hybris (Grillo 2012: 121–30); at 740–4 and 752–60 the same fabulous riches indict the insatiable mercenary ambitions of the Caesarians.

**728–9 ut Hesperio uidit satis arua natare | sanguine:** the recrimination against Caesar is conveyed in the emotive phrase *Hesperio . . . sanguine* (made vivid by hyperbaton and enjambment) and sharpened by the momentary, assonant paradox *arua natare. uidit*: the attention to Caesar’s vision will reach its climax at 786–99. *satis . . . natare* ‘were drenched enough’ (*OLD nato* 3); cf. 294 *immensa populos in caede natantes*.

**729–30 parcendum ferro manibusque suorum | iam ratus:** cf. 1.147 (of Caesar) *numquam temerando parcere ferro*, a phrase describing Caesar’s propensity for initiating violence; here he at last calls an end to it. *parcendum*: sc. *esse*; an impersonal use of the gerundive after *ratus*. Caesar thinks to ‘spare’ the swords and hands of his own troops rather than the soldiers to whom he is showing mercy.

**730-1** *ut uiles animas perituraque frustra | agmina permisit uitae* 'granted life to souls on the grounds that they were of little account and to columns of men who would die to no purpose' (*OLD* *ut* 10). The clause is invigorated by the inversion *agmina permisit uitae* for *agminibus permisit uitam*; Housman *ad Man.* 4.846 aptly remarks on Lucan's 'enthusiasm for innovation' in such expressions. The perspective is clearly Caesar's (for his view of the rank and file more generally cf. 5.343 '*humanum paucis uiuit genus*') and offers a counterpoint to the significance attributed to the continuing battle at 689-97. For *uiles animas* cf. Virg. *A.* 11.372-3 (Drances) '*nos animae uiles, inhumata infletaque turba, | sternamur campis*'; Caesar's soldiers refer to themselves as *uiles animae* at 5.263 and 5.683.

**732-4** Cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.95.1 *Caesar Pompeianis ex fuga intra uallum compulsis nullum spatium perterritis dare oportere existimans milites cohortatus est ut beneficio Fortunae uterentur castraque oppugnarent* (cf. also App. *BCiv.* 2.81.341-3; Plut. *Caes.* 45.7, 46.1, *Pomp.* 72.5).

**732** *reuocent*: i.e. allow them to reunite after being scattered in flight (cf. *OLD* 15); the verb lightly personifies *castra*.

**732-4** *pauorem* | . . . *terror*: cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.95.1 *perterritis*, 3.98.2 (the following day Caesar addresses the republicans) *quo minore essent timore*.

**733** *succedere uallo*: the language of military prose (cf. e.g. Liv. 27.42.11 *successit uallo Romana acies*).

**734** *dum fortuna calet*: cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.95.1 *ut beneficio Fortunae uterentur*. It is characteristic of Lucan's Caesar to strike while the iron is hot (cf. *OLD* *caleo* 1c); cf. 1.140-1 *instare fauori | numinis*. ***dum conficit omnia terror*** 'while terror was accomplishing everything' (*OLD* *conficio* 1); *conficit* may also suggest 'overwhelms' (*OLD* 14a). *dum* regularly takes the present indicative for continued action in past time (A-G §556).

**735** *graue* 'arduous' (*OLD* 10d); Caesar's confidence is emphasized by the hyperbaton *graue . . . imperium*. ***Marte subactis*** 'exhausted by the battle'; cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.95.2 *magno aestu fatigati*; App. *BCiv.* 2.81.342 σώματα ἔκαμνε 'weary in body': a different sense from 613 *saeuo Marte subactum*. At 5.240-3 Caesar, *nullo . . . Marte subactus*, is set in contrast to *per tot bella manus satiatae sanguine*.

**736** *hoc . . . imperium*: sc. *hostili succedere uallo*.

**736-7** *non magno hortamine miles | in praedam ducendus erat* 'The soldiers required no great exhortation to be led to plunder'; cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.97.1 *Caesar castris potitus a militibus contendit ne in praeda occupati reliqui negoti gerendi facultatem dimitterent. non magno hortamine*. cf. Ov. *Met.*

1.277–8 (Neptune) ‘*non est hortamine longo | nunc ait ‘utendum’*. In Ovid the phrase conveys the speaker’s urgency, here it denotes the readiness of Caesar’s troops. **miles:** collective singular. *ducendus erat:* the gerundive conveys necessity and is to be taken closely with *non magno hortamine*.

**738 plena** ‘complete’ (*OLD* 13a). **pro sanguine merces:** when Caesar speaks to his troops earlier in the poem about rewards, he alludes to a triumph (1.301–2, 5.328–32) or a triumph followed by land distributions (1.340–2); at 299–300 he speaks of his ability to distribute the property of nations and kings.

**739 meum est** ‘it is my task’ + inf. (*OLD* *meus* 5). **neque enim donare uocabo** ‘for I shall not call it a reward’ (*OLD* *uoco* ga); *enim* explains *monstrare*. i.e. why he will merely show where the reward lies and not bestow it himself.

**740 cunctis . . . metallis** ‘every precious metal’ (Braund), better than taking *cunctis* as dative with *patent*. This is most likely metonymy for objects made of precious metals (*TLL* VIII.874.25–8); cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.96.1 *magnum argenti pondus expositum*. **en** ‘see!’ picks up 739 *monstrare* and calls the soldiers’ attention to the visible camp.

**740–2 metallis | . . . aurum | . . . gazas:** the enticements to plunder gain emphasis from coming last in their lines. *Eoas . . . gazas*, both loanwords (< ἑὼς, γάζα), mark Pompey’s camp as a place of exotic luxury: cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.96.1–2 *in castris Pompei uidere licuit trichilas structas, magnum argenti pondus expositum, recentibus caespitibus tabernacula constrata, Luci etiam Lentuli et nonnullorum tabernacula protecta edera, multaque praeterea quae nimiam luxuriam et uictoriae fiduciam designarent, ut facile existimari posset nihil eos de euentu eius diei timuisse qui non necessarias conquirent uoluptates. at hi miserrimo ac patientissimo exercitu Caesaris luxuriam obiebant, cui semper omnia ad necessarium usum defuissent*.

**741–2 Hesperii . . . Eoasque:** the extremes of the world.

**741 raptum Hesperii e gentibus aurum:** i.e. from Spain; cf. 755 *quidquid fodit Hiber, quidquid Tagus expulit auri*. *Hesperiae gentes* refers to Spain at 4.352 (cf. 7.871 *Hesperiae clades*, a probable reference to Munda); in *BC* it more usually denotes Italy (as at 2.358, 5.329, 6.585, 10.387).

**743–4 tot regum fortuna simul Magnique coacta | expectat dominos** ‘The amassed wealth of so many kings together with that of Magnus awaits its owners’. *fortuna* (*OLD* 12) is personified as subject of *expectat dominos*.

**744 praecedere:** turning the rout into a footrace with the camp as its prize.

**745** *quascumque tuas Pharsalia fecit*: for the transformative effect of victory cf. 1.279 (Curio) ‘*tua nos faciet uictoria ciues*’.

**746** *a uictis rapiuntur opes*: in Caesar’s paradoxical logic, the losers are plundering their own possessions, now the rightful property of the victors. For a similar paradox, cf. Virg. *A.* 3.288 *AENEAS HAEC DE DANAIS VICTORIBVS ARMA*. **opes**: the key persuasive word of the speech is delayed until last place.

**746–9** [*nec plura ... duces*]: Housman (xxv–xxvi) made a convincing case to delete these lines as an interpolation for the following reasons. (i) Within lines 736–50, these verses are *both* superfluous to sense (not by itself damning) *and* they introduce a number of nonsensical elements. (ii) They vary in form in different MSS: 746 *nec plura locutus* appears in **Z<sup>2</sup>UV** with line 747, while *sic milite iusso* appears in **ΩC**, without line 747 and punctuated as a complete sentence to 750; the latter is made awkward since the ablative absolute denotes the same people as the direct object. *petentes* (an ablative absolute is usually independent of the subject or object of the verb: *NLS* §93). *sic milite iusso* was read by *Comm. Bern.*, which means only that the reading predates the tenth century. (iii) The variation of the prepositions *super* and *supra* is meaningless, uncharacteristic and feeble. (iv) Line 748 implies that *gladii* have the same sacrosanctity as *cadauera patrum*. (v) Lines 748–9 locate *cadauera* and *caesi duces* in the wrong part of the battle, between Caesar’s victorious forces and the fleeing Pompeians (‘all this fuss is made about corpses which were lying behind them and had been trodden on already, and would be trodden on again, not if the victors pressed forward to the enemy’s camp, but if they turned back to their own’, Housman xxvi).

Perotta 1965 defends the lines on the basis that they accord with Lucan’s stylistic choices elsewhere in the poem (e.g. 747 ~ 1.87) and that they echo or anticipate themes from lines around them (e.g. 752–4). Both would be the case for lines written by an interpolator familiar with Lucan’s style and supplementing his narrative. Perotta fails to convince that 748 is justified by 744–5 *propera praecedere, miles, | quos sequeris*.

**749–50** *quae fossa, quis agger | sustineat pretium belli scelerumque petentes?* A common military detail (cf. e.g. Caes. *Gal.* 7.87.3 *neque aggeres neque fossae uim hostium sustinere poterant*) is deployed in hyperbole to service Lucan’s moralizing.

**751** *scire ruunt, quanta fuerint mercede nocentes* ‘they rush to know for how great a price they have been stained with crime’. *scire*: infinitive of purpose after a verb of motion; an archaic and colloquial construction



taken up by late republican and Augustan poets (e.g. Virg. *A.* 1. 527–8 *non nos . . . populare penates | uenimus*), see NLS §28. *quanta . . . mercede*: ablative of price.

**752–7** The subject of 754 *non impleuit* must be either (a) supplied from 753 *massae* or (b) understood, with the lines repunctuated, as the clauses at 755–6 (*quiquid . . . quod . . .*). The latter option is less satisfactory, since it leaves 757 *rapiant* without an explicit object and detracts rhetorical force from 757 *paruo*.

**752 quidem** emphasizes *inuenere* ('indeed they did find') in anticipation of 754 *sed*. **spoliato . . . mundo**: ablative absolute; for the phrase *spoliatus mundus* cf. 10.169 *discit opes Caesar spoliati perdere mundi*.

**753 bellorum in sumptus** 'with a view to the costs of the war' (*OLD* in 21); *bellorum*: poetic plural.

**754 non impleuit** 'it did not satisfy' (*OLD* 10a), sc. *massa*.

**755–7** A tricolon crescendo conveying the scale of the wealth found, undercut by 757 *paruo*.

**755 quiquid . . . quiquid . . . auri** 'all the gold that . . .' (*OLD quisquis* 2b); understand *auri* (partitive genitive) in both clauses. The construction in this context was a cliché: cf. e.g. Sen. *Thy.* 353–5 *non quiquid fodit Occidens | aut unda Tagus aurea | claro deuehit alueo* (further examples at *TLL* vi.992.73–8). Spain's gold was proverbial (Mela 2.86 *Hispania . . . auro . . . abundans*). The Tagus, a river in Lusitania (Barrington 26B–D2), was also renowned for its gold (cf. e.g. Plin. *Nat.* 33.66; *TLL* ii.1526.47–8).

**756 legit . . . summis . . . harenis** 'gathers on the surface of his sands'. The Romans called a lode of gold found on the uppermost level of the earth (*in summo caespite*) 'talutium'; though extremely rare, a sensational example had occurred in Dalmatia during Nero's principate: see Plin. *Nat.* 33.67. **Arimaspus**: a mythical Scythian nation (*OCD* s.v. 'Arimaspeans'); the plain they inhabited was famous for its gold (Hdt 3.116); cf. 3.280–1 *auroque ligatas | substringens Arimaspe comas*. *Arimaspe* is singular for plural.

**757 ut**: concessive (*OLD* 35). **paruo**: ablative of price (NLS §87 (iii)). **uenisse** 'was sold' (*OLD ueneo* 1c).

**758 Tarpeias . . . arces**: the Capitolium (for the plural cf. *OLD arx* 1b; Ov. *Met.* 15.866). The metonymy derives from the Tarpeian Rock, named after Tarpeia, who betrayed the Capitol to the Sabines (Var. *L.* 5.41; *OCD* s.vv. 'Tarpeia', 'Tarpeian Rock'). **desponderit** 'has pledged' (*OLD* 2); subjunctive in a causal *cum*-clause.

**759 spe Romanae . . . praedae** ‘in the expectation of Roman plunder’ (*OLD spes* 1b). *spe praedae* is a stock phrase in historiography; it commonly attributes motivation to both Roman and foreign troops.

**760 decipitur** ‘he is disappointed’ (*OLD* 2a); the subject is *miles*, not Caesar. Terse irony concludes the passage.

## 760–786 THE DREAMS OF THE CAESARIANS

This passage may be understood as developing the same kind of post-battle details as found in App. *BCiv.* 2.81.344: that Caesar took up quarters (ἐστᾶθμενσε) in the Pompeian camp after the battle; that Caesar ate Pompey’s supper; and that his army feasted at their enemies’ expense. Lucan defers Caesar’s meal to the following morning (792) in order to exploit here the horror of sleeping in the beds of one’s enemies, many of whom are kinsmen. In the context of literary representations of dreams, lines 760–76 are remarkable for recounting the dream of a collective subject, a novelty in keeping with the greater prominence accorded by Lucan to anonymous collective groups (see Gall 2005). Some details may be drawn from Lucr. 4.1020–23, a *locus classicus* of ‘anxiety dreams’: the body moving in imitation of the subject matter of the dreams (767n.) and perhaps also the *mens conscia* as their cause (784n.). Nevertheless, the concept of anxiety dreams stemming from a guilty conscience was widespread; cf. e.g. Diod. Sic. 29.25.1 on Philip V of Macedon, haunted by ‘dreams and terrors of a guilty conscience’ for the rest of his life after having his son executed. See further Walde 2001: 410–16; Narducci 2002: 225–7; on non-divine dreams in historical literature see Harrison 2013: 59–62.

**760–3** A tricolon crescendo illustrates the Caesarians’ disregard for social hierarchies and familial *pietas*.

**760–1 capit . . . somnos** ‘sleeps’ (*OLD capio* 15d).

**760 impia:** explained by *patricio*, they usurp the place of social superiors.

**761 caespit patricio:** cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.96.1 *in castris Pompei uidere licuit . . . recentibus caespitibus tabernacula constrata* (‘. . . tents floored with freshly cut turf’, trans. Damon).

**761–2 stratumque cubile | regibus** ‘and beds prepared for kings’, singular for plural (*OLD sterno* 2a).

**762 premit** ‘lies on’ (*OLD* 14a).

**762–3 inque parentum | inque toris fratrum:** emotive repetition sharpens the climactic disregard for familial bonds.

**764 quos:** i.e. *sed eos* (*OLD qui* 14a). **agitat** ‘harasses’ (*OLD* 8b; cf. Cic. *Rosc.* 67 *suum quemque scelus agitat*); cf. 775 *hunc agitant totis fraterna cadauera somnis*. **uesana quies:** cf. 7–44n.; their rest is personified, as though a hounding Fury (cf. *OLD agito* 3b). *uesanus* is a favourite word of Lucan’s (× 13 in *BC*). **somnique furentes** ‘savage sleep’ (the plural of *somnus* is regularly identical in sense to the singular); the phrase extends the use of *furo* of actions (*TLL* vi.1628.35–8) and may call to mind Furies and Maenads, to whom the verb is regularly applied and who will be invoked at 777–80.

**765 miseris:** very often of the war’s victims in *BC*. **uersant** ‘keeps active’ (*OLD* 9a). **in pectore:** i.e. in their minds; the breast was considered the seat of one’s intellectual faculties (*OLD pectus* 3b); cf. Virg. *A.* 4.563 *illa dolos dirumque nefas in pectore uersat*.

**766 inuigilat cunctis saeuum scelus** ‘their crime stays awake for everyone’. *inuigilare* + dat. typically means ‘stay awake over’ (cf. *OLD* 1a; the usual expression would be *inuigilant cuncti saeuis sceleribus*); Lucan has reversed the grammar of the idiom along with its meaning: now their personified crimes ‘stay awake’ while the Caesarians themselves sleep.

**766–7 armaque tota | mente agitant** ‘they brandish weapons with their whole mind’, or ‘in their obsessed mind’ (lit. ‘all over their mind’, *OLD totus* 3d); cf. Cic. *Att.* 13.12.4 (SB 320) *de Scapulanis hortis toto pectore cogitemus. agitant*, following 764 *agitat* and followed by 775 *agitant*, provides a good example of an indifference to repetition that Lucan sometimes shows (cf. Housman xxxiii).

**766 capuloque . . . absente:** ablative absolute with concessive force; *capulo* stands for *gladio* (metonymy).

**767 manus . . . mouentur:** for physically imitating the content of a dream cf. Lucr. 4.1015–17, esp. 1015 *multi depugnant*.

**768 ingemuisse . . . campos:** the narrator supposes that the personified landscape groans in grief (cf. *Comm. Bern.*: *doluisse*), an example of the ‘pathetic fallacy’: cf. Virg. *A.* 6.871–2 *quantos ille uirum magnam Mauortis ad urbem | campus aget gemitus*. **putem** ‘I could think that’. The potential subjunctive allows the narrator to introduce supernatural explanations (conveyed by the infinitives *ingemuisse*, *inspirasse* and *infectum* [sc. *esse*]) into this otherwise predominately psychological account.

**768–9 terramque nocentem | inspirasse animas:** cf. Virg. *A.* 7.351 (Allecto’s snake) *uipeream inspirans animam*. Ω’s *nocentem* is a better reading than *nocentes* (found in cod. Vat. 3284 and printed by Shackleton Bailey): for *terram nocentem* cf. e.g. 869, 9.81, Munda at 692 and Egypt at

10.3, all cited by Housman. He doubted that this clause referred to the earth emitting shades of the dead and read *animas* as a synonym of *auras*, i.e. vapours (*OLD anima* 10) on the grounds that *manes* are not ‘breathed into’ (*OLD* 4). However, it is difficult to disassociate *animas* from *manes* (*OLD anima* 6a) in view of the context and following clauses, and it may be that Lucan intended the striking image of souls being emitted from the earth and ‘breathed into’ the sleeping men: cf. Sen. *Thy.* 87–8 (the soul of Tantalus) *mittor ut dirus uapor | tellure rupta*; Stat. *Theb.* 12.712–13 (Theseus, on the Theban plain amid the unburied dead) *dirisque uaporibus aegrum | aëra puluerea penitus sub casside ducens*.

**769–70 infectumque . . . | manibus** ‘infected with the shades of the dead’, an arresting phrase that posits the *manes* themselves as contaminants (the physical remnants of slaughter are more commonly said to infect airs or waters); it reflects the psychology of the Caesarians, who view the ghosts of their victims as a threat to their well-being. Cf. Stat. *Theb.* 11.422 (*manes*) *infecere diem*.

**770 et superam Stygia formidine noctem** ‘and the night of the world above by Stygian terror’ (*OLD superus* 2a), sc. *infectam esse*. This summative clause is tightened by the concentric arrangement of adjectives and their nouns (cf. Virg. *G.* 4.468 (the underworld) *caligantem nigra formidine lucum*), and the juxtaposed opposites *superam Stygia*.

**771–2 uictoria**, personified in terms suggestive of a Fury (*sibilaque et flammās*: cf. Virg. *A.* 7.447–9 *tot Erinys sibilat hydrys | . . . flammea torquens | lumina*), exacts a paradoxical punishment from the victorious, who are cast as *meriti* in the bad sense of people whose actions deserve an appropriate response (*OLD meritis* 3b). The evocation of the Furies is apposite in view of their role in punishing crimes within families (cf. 775–6) and against those deserving protection or respect (*OCD* s.v. ‘Erinys’), such as fellow *ciues* (cf. 773).

**772–3 umbra perempti | ciuis:** the key term evoking the betrayal of *fides* is emphasized by enjambment.

**773 sua . . . terroris imago:** i.e. an apparition particular to each individual soldier (*OLD suus* 10a); cf. Cic. *S. Rosc.* 67 (denying the existence of the Furies) *sua quemque fraus et suus terror maxime uexat, suum quemque scelus agitat amentiaque adfcit, suae malae cogitationes conscientiaeque animi terrent*. Lucan’s phrase recalls and replaces the *pietatis imago* to which the Caesarians were to remain impervious at 320. The idea will develop and accumulate rhetorical weight in *distributio* (Lausberg 1998 §675) through lines 774–6 (*ille . . . ille . . . | hunc . . . in hoc*) before being answered by 776 *omnes in Caesare manes*. **premit** ‘afflicts’ (*OLD* 8a).

**774–6** *senum . . . iuuenum . . . fraterna . . . pater*: the division is arranged in chiasmus of elder and contemporary victims.

**774** *figuras* ‘images’ (*OLD* 8b); cf. Lucr. 4.34–5 *in somnis . . . saepe figuras | contuimur miras simulacraque luce carentum*.

**775** *agitant* ‘harass’ (*OLD* 8b), cf. 764; here anticipating the Eumenides at 778 (cf. e.g. Virg. *A.* 3.331 *Furiis agitatus*). **fraterna cadauera**: plural for singular; the phrase calculated to shock (cf. 597–8n. on *cadaver*).

**776** *pectore in hoc . . . in Caesare*: cf. 10.336 (of Pothinus, after Pompey’s death) *habitant sub pectore manes*. **omnes in Caesare manes**: a climactic phrase and a grotesque variation on Caesar’s totalizing position within the poem (cf. e.g. 3.108 *omnia Caesar erat*): ‘here too Caesar’s imperialist expansiveness crowds out everyone else’ (Hardie 1993: 42).

**777–80** An allusion to Virg. *A.* 4.469–73 (of Dido, hounded by Aeneas in her dreams) *Eumenidum ueluti demens uidet agmina Pentheus | et solem geminum et duplices se ostendere Thebas, | aut Agamemnonius scaenis agitatus Orestes, | armatam facibus matrem et serpentibus atris | cum fugit ultricesque sedent in limine Dirae*.

**777** *haud alios*: with *uultus*: an emphatic phrase (negation + *alius*: cf. Oakley on Liv. 7.31.1) enhanced by hyperbaton. **nondum Scythica purgatus in ara**: Orestes was never purified on the altar of Artemis at Tauris (Diana Scythica, cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.331), which is clearly Lucan’s meaning (cf. ASL: *Orestes furens in Taurica regione a sorore Iphigenia, Dianae Scythicae sacerdote, sanatus adseritur*). An oracle of Apollo had declared to Orestes that the removal of a statue of Artemis from Tauris to Athens would end his persecution by the Furies (Eur. *IT* 77–92). The need to purify him (in the sea) was part of Iphigenia’s ruse to bring about his escape. He had been consecrated on the altar of Artemis (Eur. *IT* 1320). Orestes had been purified of the matricide at the hearth of Apollo in Delphi (Aesch. *Eum.* 282–3), and Pausanias records other locales where Orestes was reputed to have been purified (Troezen 2.31.4, Ceryneia 7.25.7); the purification was frequently represented in art (*LIMC* s.v. ‘Orestes’, nos. 48–54).

**778** *Eumenidum uidit uultus* recalls 774 *uultus . . . uidet*. For the faces of the Furies cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 990 ἐκ τῶν φοβερῶν τῶνδε προσώπων ‘from these fearful faces’; Virg. *A.* 7.415 (Allecto’s) *toruam faciem*; Ov. *Met.* 9.410 *uultibus Eumenidum matrisque agitatibus umbris*. **Pelopeus Orestes**: a patronymic based on Pelops, Orestes’ great-grandfather, the founder of the Pelopid dynasty (cf. Prop. 4.6.33 *Pelopeum Agamemnona*). The adjective may have been chosen because Pelops himself was a murderer, for which he was cursed.

**779** *nec magis attonitos animi sensere tumultus* ‘felt a mental distress no more frenzied’ (*OLD* *attonitus* 4b, *tumultus* 5); cf. Sen. *Thy.* 260 *tumultus pectora attonitus quatit*.

**780** Dionysus drove Pentheus mad in retribution for imprisoning him. In his deranged state he was induced to disguise himself as a Maenad and spy on the ecstatic behaviour of the Theban women on Mt Cithaeron, where he was discovered and dismembered by the women, led by his mother Agave. In her ecstasy Agave carried the head of Pentheus to Thebes in triumph, and after recovering her senses (*desisset*: sc. *furere*), realized what she has done: cf. Luc. 1.574–5 (a Fury) *Thebanam qualis Agauen | impulit*. Note Lucan’s paradox, that Agave was frenzied after recovering from her *furor*. At 6.357–9 Lucan claims that Agave brought the head of Pentheus to Thessaly. The canonical telling of the myth is in Euripides’ *Bacchae*.

**781–3** The apparitions of 772–6 are now replaced by or described as *gladii* (by metonymy) and split into two groups (781–2 *aut* . . . | *aut*): victims at Pharsalus and future assassins of Caesar.

**781** *hunc*: Caesar. **omnes gladii**: echoing 776 *omnes in Caesare manes*.

**782** *ultrix uisura dies* [sc. *est*]: the Ides of March 44, personified as an agent of revenge. *ultrix* . . . *dies* surely puns on *ultrices deae*, the Furies (cf. 10.337; Sen. *Med.* 13), a wordplay helped by the gender of *dies*, feminine because it refers to a specific day (cf. *OLD* *dies*). For the image cf. Stat. *Theb.* 10.244; Sil. 2.495 (both *ultor*). Caesar’s assassination is variously foreshadowed throughout *BC*; cf. 1.691 (the *matrona*’s vision) ‘*impiaque in medio peraguntur bella senatu*’, 6.801–2 (Pluto) *paratque | poenam uictori* (cf. 6.810–11), 7.451 (n.), 8.609–10 *scelus hoc quo nomine dicent | qui Bruti dixere nefas?*, 10.528–9 (unusually explicit) *dum patrii ueniant in uiscera Caesaris enses | Magnus inultus erit*. Ahl 1976: 318 n. 23 suggests some further, less explicit, evocations. Marti 1970 argued that the poem was designed to end (in sixteen books) with Caesar’s assassination, but most find the model of a twelve-book epic patterned on Virgil’s *Aeneid* more attractive; for surveys of possible planned end points see Ahl 1976: 306–26 and Masters 1992: 216–59. **stringente senatu** ‘with the senate unsheathing [its swords]’, ablative absolute with the object of the verb unexpressed.

**783** *illa nocte*: ablative of time. **premunt** conveys different nuances for each group of swords: ‘afflict’ (*OLD* 8a; as at 773) with *quos* . . . *Pharsalia uidit*, used of committed crimes that burden one’s conscience (*TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.1177.59–72); with *quos* . . . | . . . *ultrix uisura dies* a more threatening nuance is required: ‘crowd or throng round’ (*OLD* 9a), or ‘overpower (with weapons)’ (*OLD* 16b). **infera monstra** ‘underworld prodigies’

(cf. Sen. *De ira* 2.35.5 *qualia poetae inferna monstra finxerunt succincta serpentibus et igneo flatu*), as focalized by Caesar; they are the same republican victims described at 781 as *omnes gladii. inferus* of the dead need not always be negative (cf. *CIL* I.1596 DEIS INFERVM PARENTVM SACRVM). **flagell-**  
**lant:** used figuratively, they torment his conscience: cf. Lucr. 3.1018–19 *mens sibi conscia facti | praemetuens adhibet stimulos torretque flagellis* (with Kenney’s note on the text; cf. 784n. on *mens conscia*). The verb continues the characterization of the dead as Furies (cf. *OLD flagella* 1a).

**784 quantum poenae** ‘how much of his punishment’: an exclamatory neuter adjective and partitive genitive (*NLS* §77). *poenae* in this context puns on Ποινᾶί (*LSJ* ποινή II; *OLD poena* 1d; cf. Lucr. 3.1011–14 with Kenney). **mens conscia:** cf. Lucr. 3.1018 (quoted at 783n.). **donat** ‘remits’ (*OLD* 4a; cf. Sen. *Clem.* 1.20.2 *poenam, si tuto poterit, donet*).

**785–6 quod Styga, quod manes ingestaque Tartara somnis | Pompeio uiuente uidet!** a tricolon crescendo, its emotional effect enhanced by anaphora. *Styga* . . . *Tartara:* *Styga* is a Greek accusative singular; *Tartara* is a (metrically useful) neuter accusative plural; both are metonyms for the *manes* seen by Caesar. As topographical details they suggest momentarily that Caesar dreams of a katabasis rather than that the dead visit him (cf. 768–70, 773 *ciuis adest*). *ingestaque* . . . *somnis* ‘thrust upon his dreams’ (*OLD ingero* 3). *Pompeio uiuente.* (ablative absolute) previous commentators mislead on Lucan’s point: Caesar was spared a vision of Pompey’s shade, a ‘punishment’ that would have surpassed the visions described in line 785.

## 786–824 CAESAR VIEWS THE DEAD

This section begins the larger aftermath narrative with which book 7 concludes (786–824: Caesar among the dead; 825–46: the bodies plundered by carrion animals; 847–72: the apostrophe to Thessaly). Earlier examples of literary aftermaths include Sal. *Cat.* 61 (Pistoria) and Liv. 22.51.5–9 (Cannae); for examples after Lucan cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.61–2, *Hist.* 2.70; Stat. *Theb.* 12.1–59; Sil. 10.449–53. Lucan exploits the potential of the aftermath narrative as a closural device (cf. Sal. *Cat.* 61) in which prominent roles are assigned to visual perception, here continuing the dream visions of the previous section (cf. 789 *haerentes oculos, cernit*, 791 *spectat*, 792 *numerat*, 794 *agnoscat*, 796 *cernit*, 797 *laeta* . . . *spectacula*), and to the evidence of the workings of fortune (796). For aftermath narratives more generally see Pagán 2000: 425–34.

In Plutarch’s *Caesar* gazing upon the dead offers an opportunity for pathos, pity or self-justification: at Dyrrachium Cato covers his head and goes away in tears (41.1); at Pharsalus, ‘when (Caesar) reached Pompey’s



ramparts and saw those of the enemy who were already lying dead there and those who were still falling, said with a groan: “They would have it so; they brought me to such a pass that if I, Gaius Caesar, after waging successfully the greatest wars, had dismissed my forces, I should have been condemned in their courts” (46.1, trans. Perrin). Lucan’s Caesar by contrast is pleased (794, 797) by a spectacle from which he is unwilling to remove his gaze. It is inviting to read Caesar’s meal amid the carnage as symbolic of cannibalism, which in other battle contexts typically indicates the uncontrolled rage of the combatants (e.g. Liv. 22.51.9; Stat. *Theb.* 8.751–66; cf. also Harvard 1972.40, a late sixth-century red-figure kalpis hydria on which Achilles dines over the corpse of Hector and stains it with meat from his table). Although Lucan does lay stress upon the continuing *ira* of Caesar (802, 809), his macabre meal has a closer thematic affinity with the tyrant’s ‘cannibalistic eye’. On the nexus of associations between abnormal eating, cruelty and the tyrannical gaze see Leigh 1997b. In tragedy these associations were presented literally, but other genres sublimated them into metaphorical gestures such as Caesar’s meal (cf. also 2.121–4, quoted at 792n.): ‘History and rhetoric, . . . more reticent about accusing their subjects of the literal practice of cannibalism, repeatedly employ a metaphorical system which attributes an equivalent crime to the tyrant’s criminal gaze’ (Leigh 1997b: 186). Both Ahl (1976: 213–14) and Johnson (1987: 102) have drawn a connection between this passage and 6.579–88, where Erictho anticipates despoiling and mutilating the bodies of the slain.

When at 799–803 Caesar denies burial to the dead and thus fails even by the standards of Hannibal’s humanity, he simultaneously defies the epic convention whereby a truce is negotiated and observed for the burial of the dead (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 7.375–8, 7.394–7, 7.408–11, 7.421–32; Virg. *A.* 11.100–21 with Horsfall on 108–19) and brings to a culmination a sequence of comparisons in the poem between himself and the Carthaginian general. At 1.30–1 the civil war’s impact upon Italy was worse than that of Pyrrhus and Hannibal; at 1.205–12 Caesar is compared to a Libyan lion; at 1.255 the people of Ariminum compare Caesar’s invasion of Italy to the Punic invasion of 207; at 1.303–5 Caesar says that Rome reacts as if Hannibal had crossed the Alps; at 2.45–6 men lament that they were not alive in the age of Cannae and Trebia. In book 7, one model for Caesar’s speech at 250–329 is Livy’s Hannibal at the Ticinus, while at 408–9 Cannae and the Alia are cited as inferior in significance to Pharsalus. See Ahl 1976: 107–12; Masters 1992: 1 n. 1; Day 2013: 116–33.

At 809–19 the philosophical argument that renders Caesar’s *ira* ineffectual is characteristically eclectic: the ‘Epicurean’ argument of corporeal disintegration (810–11n.) leads to the Stoic concepts



of conflagration (812–13) and astral immortality (816) before the Epicurean ‘return to earth’ argument is reprised at 818–19.

**786 tamen** anticipates the implied concession in *passo* (i.e. (*quamuis*) *omnia passo, tamen* . . .; cf. Housman on 1.333): the horrors of the night should have been enough to sate Caesar’s gaze. **passo**: dative of reference with *reuocat oculos*.

**787 postquam clara dies Pharsalica damna retexit**: the dawn of 10 August 48 (the previous daybreak was described at 45 *uicerat astra iubar*). According to Caes. *Civ.* 3.98 on the dawn of this day Caesar called down, disarmed, comforted and pardoned enemy soldiers still hiding in the hills. Aftermath scenes are frequently separated by a barrier of time from the battle itself: cf. Liv. 22.51.5 *postero die, ubi primum illuxit, ad spolia legenda foedamque etiam hostibus spectandam stragem insistent* (Pagán 2000: 432). *clara dies* ‘clear daylight’. In contrast to the sun’s reluctance to illuminate Thessaly the day before, the present day now uncovers the full scale of the crime. *Pharsalica damna* ‘the losses at Pharsalus’ (*OLD* *damnum* 2c), originally a financial metaphor; for the phrase cf. 1.106 *Parthica* . . . *damna*, 2.475 *Gallica damna. retexit*. cf. Virg. *A.* 1.356 *caecumque domus scelus omne retexit*.

**788 nulla** ‘in no way’, ‘not at all’ (*OLD* 6), used adverbially with *reuocat*.

**789 haerentes oculos**: the detail of Caesar’s unbroken gaze (*OLD* *haereo* 6a) is delayed and enjambed for emphasis; cf. Virg. *A.* 1.717–18 *haec oculis, haec pectore toto | haeret*.

**789–91 cernit propulsa cruore | flumina et excelsos cumulis aequantia colles | corpora, sidentes in tabem spectat acruos**: the *loci facies* is elaborated in a tricolon of clauses describing the objects of Caesar’s gaze.

**789–90 cernit propulsa cruore | flumina**: blood draining off the plain in rivers (*TLL* x<sup>2</sup>.1969.68–9): cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.451 ῥέε δ’ αἵματι γαῖα ‘and the earth flowed with blood’; 4.785 (one of the spectacles of victory) *fluuios* . . . *cruoris*; 7.292 *uideor fluuios spectare cruoris*; 7.636–7 *cunctos haerere cruores | Romanus campisque uetat consistere torrens*. For *cruor* see 292n.

**790–1** Cf. Liv. 30.34.10 *per cumulos corporum armorumque et tabem sanguinis*. **excelsos** . . . **aequantia colles | corpora**: hyperbole augments the image of the mounds of dead, a common historiographical detail (e.g. Liv. 22.7.5, 22.59.3): cf. 6.180–1 *cumulo crescente cadauera murum | admouere solo*. The key detail *corpora* gains emphasis from enjambment and the pause after the first foot.

**790 cumulis**: ablative of instrument.

**791 sidentes** ‘subsiding’ (*OLD* 3a). **in tabem:** cf. 2.166–7 *cum iam tabe fluunt confusaque tempore multo | amisere notas*. This is a different kind of hyperbole from 790–1: here the process of decay is radically accelerated. This detail foreshadows the prediction at 845–6 that the human remains at Pharsalus will be absorbed into the plain. **aceruos:** cf. Virg. *A.* 10.508 (the narrator, to Pallas) *ingentes Rutulorum linquis acervos!*

**792 et Magni numerat populos:** cf. 294 *immensa populos in caede natantes*, 635 *per populos hic Roma perit*; Caes. *Civ.* 3.99.4 *ex Pompeiano exercitu circiter milia xv cecidisse uidebantur*. Caesar’s ability to reckon the number of nations on Pompey’s side speaks to his lingering, avid gaze. **epulisque paratur:** cf. App. *BCiv.* 2.81.344 (the evening of the battle) αὐτός τε τὴν ἐκείνου βρώμην καὶ ὁ στρατὸς ἅπας τὴν τῶν πολεμίων ἐδαΐσαντο (‘he himself feasted on [Pompey’s] dinner, and the whole army feasted on that of their enemy’). To dine near the dead or dying reflects the cruelty and appetites of the tyrant: cf. Sen. *Contr.* 9.2.7 *o qui crudelitate omnis superasti tyrannos! soli tibi inter epulas uoluptati est morientium gemitus*. Caesar’s meal is foreshadowed in the Marian proscriptions at 2.122–4 *Antoni, cuius laceris pendentia canis | ora ferens miles festae rorantia mensae | imposuit*.

**793 ille locus:** cf. Sen. *Ag.* 11 *hic epulis locus. ille* anticipates the relative clause (*OLD* 3a). The grotesque setting and Caesar’s apparent solitude are a perversion of epic’s normative scenes of communal feasting (see 786–824n.).

**793–4 uultus ex quo faciesque iacentum | agnoscat:** cf. 1.685–6 *hunc ego . . . | qui iacet, agnosco*, 2.190–3 *quid . . . | iuuat . . . Marii confundere uultum? | ut scelus hoc Sullae . . . placeret | agnoscendus erat*; Sen. *Ep.* 83.25 (Antony) *inter apparatissimas epulas luxusque regales ora ac manus proscriptorum recognosceret*. Recognizing, distinguishing or identifying the dead is elsewhere in the poem the sad duty of relatives: cf. 2.169–73 (the proscribed), 3.758–61 (Massilian victims). *ex quo . . . agnoscat*: a relative clause of purpose.

**794–5 iuuat Emathiam non cernere terram | et lustrare oculis campos sub clade latentes:** Caesar delights in the scene. The second clause explains the paradox *non cernere terram* and confirms the hyperbole that the plain is entirely covered in corpses. *lustrare oculis* ‘cast his eyes over’ (*OLD* *lustrare* 5a). Gazing at fields that are hidden creates its own paradox. *campos sub clade latentes*: cf. Virg. *A.* 4.582 *latet sub classibus aequor*; Sen. *Phoen.* 635–6 *clade funesta iacens | obtexit agros miles* (Lanzarone). The earth more commonly ‘lies hidden’ under snow, flooding water and sim. (cf. *TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.996.31–41).

**796 fortunam superosque suos in sanguine cernit:** cf. 4.254–5 *tu, Caesar, quamvis spoliatus milite multo, | agnoscis superos*, 7.297–8 (Caesar) *haud umquam uidi tam magna datus | tam prope me superos*. This line is found only in V but should be considered genuine on the basis of its coherence with Lucan's themes, style and technique; the repetition of *cernere* so soon after 794 would not be uncharacteristic. This line marks a significant thematic juncture in book 7: whereas defeat had proved to Pompey that *Fortuna* had abandoned him (649, 666), the carnage at Pharsalus provides Caesar with conclusive evidence of her favour and that of the gods.

**797 laeta . . . scelerum spectacula:** cf. 2.208 (Sulla) *spectator sceleris*, 4.784 *laeta . . . spectacula*, of the wounded and dying bodies, corpses and spilt blood of Curio's forces, as viewed by Juba's Moorish troops; *scelerum* represents the narrator's point of view. **furens** 'in a frenzy' (Braund; cf. *Comm. Bern.*: *ferox*; *TLL* VI.1627.43–4); cf. 802 *nondum satiata caedibus ira*.

**798 inuidet igne rogi miseris** 'refuses the wretches the funeral pyre's flame' (*inuidere* with an ablative of thing and dative of recipient, see *OLD* 2c). Caesar's actions are once again foreshadowed in the crimes of the proscriptions: cf. 2.157–73, esp. 159 *dum licet, occupat ignes*, 170 *ora rogo cupidum uetitisque imponere flammis*.

**798–9 caeloque nocenti | ingerit Emathiam** 'and [thereby] foists the sight of Emathia upon the guilty gods' (*OLD* *ingero* 3a, *caelum* 3b). This sentence offers the narrator's comment upon *inuidet . . . miseris*, it does not convey intent on Caesar's part to punish or reproach the gods (*pace* Dilke; Lovatt 2013: 119; Lanzarone): Caesar sees the carnage as a *laeta . . . spectacula* and evidence of divine favour (796). *nocenti* is the view of the narrator: the gods are guilty because they have allowed so great a crime to take place.

**799–801** For Caesar compared to Hannibal see 786–824n.

**799–800 Poenus humator | consulis:** L. Aemilius Paullus (cos. 219 and 216) died in his consular year at Cannae and was buried by Hannibal; cf. Liv. 22.52.6 *consulem quoque Romanum conquistum sepultumque quidam auctores sunt*; Val. Max. 5.1 ext. 6 (an example of Hannibal's *mansuetudo*); Sil. 10.558–77 offers a narrative of the rites. *humator* is a *hapax legomenon*. **humator . . . lampade:** *hysteron proteron*.

**800 succensae** 'illuminated' (*OLD* 2; Dilke misleads). Taken in the sense 'set alight' (*OLD* 1a) it may evoke the hyperbole of a massive funeral pyre such as at 806–8. **lampade:** torches for lighting the funeral pyre (*OLD* 1b; *TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.909.64–72); singular for plural.

**801 hominum ritus** gains emphasis from the postponed conjunction. **seruet** ‘observe’ (*OLD* 4). **in hoste** ‘when dealing with an enemy’ (*OLD in* 42).

**802–3 meminit . . . | ciues esse suos:** their status as fellow citizens, which if anything should compel civilized behaviour from Caesar, paradoxically confirms him in his inhuman course of action. Caesar considers fellow citizens fighting against him as committing a greater crime and deserving harsher penalties than any enemy of the state. His actions here run contrary to his words at 314–15 ‘(uincat) quique suos ciues, quod signa aduersa tulerunt, | non credit fecisse nefas’, 319 ‘ciuis qui fugerit esto’.

**802 nondum satiata caedibus ira** ‘with his rage not yet sated by the slaughter’ (ablative absolute); cf. 809 *nil agis hac ira*, 9.950 *Caesar . . . Emathia satiatus clade recessit*. On Caesar’s characteristic *ira* in *BC* see 1.146–7 with Roche; 3.133 with Hunink; Fantam 2003: 248–9.

**803 petimus:** note the narrator’s personal petition to Caesar; Ambühl 2015: 259–76, esp. 266, sees the appeal in the first person plural as evoking a tragic chorus before a tyrant. For the formulation cf. 2.47 ‘*non pacem petimus, superi: date gentibus iras*’.

**804 unum da gentibus ignem:** cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 936 (Theseus) ‘τοὺς δέ γ’ ἄλλους πάντας ἐν μιᾷ πυρᾷ’ ‘all the others [*sc.* apart from Capaneus, I will cremate] on a single pyre’.

**805 non interpositis urantur corpora flammis** ‘let the bodies burn with no flames between them’ (*OLD interpono* 1b): i.e. not laid out individually, but heaped up and burnt en masse; developing 804 *unum . . . ignem*.

**806–8** The narrator’s more elaborate alternative: a gigantic pyre, so large as to be visible from the sea. The construction of the hero’s pyre is a standard feature of the genre (cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 23.110–60; Virg. *A.* 11.133–8, 11.184–202). Lucan’s image evokes both the pyre of Hercules on Mt Oeta (cf. Sen. *Her. F.* 1285–7 (Hercules) ‘*omne Pindi Thracis excidam nemus | Bacchique lucos et Cithaeronis iuga | mecum cremabo*’) and at 808 the pyre of Dido, visible to Aeneas as he sails from Carthage: cf. Virg. *A.* 5.3–5 *moenia respiciens, quae iam infelicitis Elissae | collucet flammis. quae tantum accenderit ignem | causa latet*.

**806 generi si poena iuuat:** punishing Pompey has not thus far been Caesar’s motivation in refusing burial to the dead; see 802–3n.

**807 erige congestas Oetaeo robore siluas** ‘pile up and raise woods of Oeta’s oak’, i.e. for the pyre (*OLD erigo* 4). Mt Oeta (449n.) was the site of Hercules’ pyre. *congestas* more naturally describes wood heaped on the pyre than trees standing in the forest (cf. Sen. *Her. F.* 1216 *structum*

*aceruans nemore congesto aggerem*), so it is preferable to take *congestas* as standing for a coordinate clause with *erige* (i.e. as *congere et erige*).

**809–11** Cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.156–7 *corpora, siue rogos flamma seu tabe uetustas | abstulerit, mala posse pati non ulla putetis!* It was a commonplace of diatribe that it did not matter whether one was buried or not: cf. Teles frag. 3 Hense ‘Now if it happens that you are not buried at all but are tossed out unburied, what is hateful in that? Indeed, what does it matter (τί διαφέρει; cf. 810 *haud refert*) whether we are consumed by fire, or are eaten by a dog, or are devoured by ravens above the ground or by worms below?’ (trans. O’Neil). The notion was taken up in a number of philosophically inclined texts in order to dispel the irrational fear of the post-mortem fate of our bodies: cf. Lucr. 3.870–5 (with Kenney); Cic. *Tusc.* 1.104; Sen. *Dial.* 9.14.3, *Ep.* 92.34–5 (Lanzarone provides further examples).

**809 nil agis hac ira** ‘you achieve nothing by this wrath’ (*OLD ago* 19a); cf. 802 *nondum satiata caedibus ira*. **tabesne** ‘whether putrefaction’ (*OLD tabes* 2a). **soluat** ‘should dissolve’ (*OLD* 13a): subjunctive in indirect question.

**810–11** Cf. Lucr. 2.999–1003 *cedit item retro, de terra quod fuit ante, | in terras, et quod missumst ex aetheris oris, | id rursum caeli rellatum templa receptant. | nec sic interemit mors res ut materiai | corpora conficiat, sed coetum dissupat ollis*. For Lucan’s readers Epicureanism, and particularly Lucretius, would have been the most obvious point of reference for these lines, but the notion of the body’s physical return to earth was not exclusively Epicurean. It was promoted by pre-Socratics such as Empedocles and Anaxagoras and is found in fifth-century literature: cf. e.g. Eur. frag. 839.8–11 *χωρεῖ δ’ ὀπίσω | τὰ μὲν ἐκ γαίης φύντ’ εἰς γαῖαν, | τὰ δ’ ἀπ’ αἰθερίου βλαστόντα γονῆς | εἰς οὐράνιον πάλιν ἦλθε πόλον* (‘Those things that were born from earth return to earth, and those that grew from ethereal seed go back to the heavenly region’, trans. Collard and Cropp); see Bailey 1947: 955–8. **placido . . . sinu** ‘in her kindly bosom/refuge’ (*OLD sinus* 3): alluding to the notion of mother earth, which frequently accompanies such ‘dust to dust’ reasoning: cf. Eur. frag. 839.6–7 *οὐκ ἄδίκως | μήτηρ πάντων νενόμισται* ‘rightly considered mother of us all’; Lucr. 2.998 *quapropter merito maternum nomen adepta est* (both precede the notion of a post-mortem return to the earth).

**811 finemque sui sibi corpora debent** ‘bodies owe their own destruction to themselves’, i.e. they will decompose of their own accord (cf. *ASL*). This *sententia* clinches 809 *nil agis hac ira* and the philosophical argument of 810–11, as though the decomposition of the dead bodies and not their proper ritual burial (allowing the entry of their souls into the underworld) were the main issue (*OCD* s.v. ‘dead, disposal of’; cf. Horsfall on Virg. A. 3.62; N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.23).

**812–15** These lines allude to the Stoic concept of the conflagration (*ekpyrosis*), the cyclical dissolution of the universe into fire. At 1.72–80, the poem's first simile, the descent of Rome into civil war is compared to the conflagration of the universe. See Lapidge 1979; Roche on Luc. 1.67–97.

**812 *hos, Caesar, populos*:** the narrator continues to set Caesar straight in direct apostrophe. The interruption of the object phrase by the vocative adds emphasis to *hos* and may suggest the speaker's heightened emotions.

**813 *uret cum terris, uret cum gurgite ponti*:** an emphatic line. The narrator's point is underscored by metre (all spondees in the first four feet), anaphora (*uret cum* . . . *uret cum*), asyndeton, parallel construction (verb, preposition + abl.) and the elevated periphrasis *gurgite ponti* (not found since Cicero and Lucretius).

**814–15 *ossibus astra | mixturus*** 'that will mix the stars with their bones': the future participle is more concise than a relative clause; cf. 5.635–6 (a storm likened to the conflagration) (*uidetur rursusque redire | nox manes mixtura deis*). The stars crash to earth in the conflagration: cf. 1.75–6 *ignea pontum | astra petent*. Here *astra* combines with *terris* and *ponti* to describe the tripartite universe (cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.483 ἐν μὲν γαῖαν ἔτευξ', ἐν δ' οὐρανόν, ἐν δὲ θάλασσαν 'on it he fashioned the earth, on it the heavens, on it the sea'; cf. Hardie 1986: 313–25).

**815–16 *quocumque tuam fortuna uocabit, | hae quoque sunt animae*** 'wherever fortune summons your soul, these souls are also there'; for *tuam* supply *animam* from 816. *sunt* is a better alternative than *erunt* (5) or *eunt* (Z<sup>2</sup>P (*un*, over an erasure) U). The latter may have derived from *ibis* in the same line, and both options require an elision before an accented syllable, which is contrary to Lucan's usage (Trampe 1884: 20–1).

**816 *non altius ibis in auras*:** Caesar's soul will not ascend any higher than theirs; it will not reach higher than the circle of the moon, which is the destination of Pompey's soul at 9.1–11: see Housman *ad loc.* For the concept cf. Sen. *Cons. Marc.* 25–6, esp. 25.1 (the soul of Metilius) *paulumque supra nos commoratus . . . deinde ad excelsa sublatus inter felices currit animas*, *Cons. Polyb.* 9, esp. 9.8 *fruitur nunc aperto et libero caelo*). The Stoics developed from the Platonic tradition the idea of 'astral immortality', 'the return of the souls of good men to the aethereal regions of the Upper Cosmos whence they came, where they spend a happy immortality contemplating the workings of Divine Reason as manifested most perfectly in the movements of the heavenly bodies' (Armstrong 1947: 144; cf. Burkert 1972: 360–8).

**817 non meliore loco Stygia sub nocte iacebis:** cf. 6.801–2 (Pluto) *paratque | poenam uictori*.

**818–19** The narrator reprises the argument of 810–11 with an asyndetic sequence of three *sententia* each increasing in length.

**818 libera Fortunae mors est:** i.e. the condition of death is free from the vagaries of chance, the same for everybody: a formulation that denies influence to Caesar's favouring deity. For *liber* + gen., a Greek construction adopted by the Augustan poets, cf. *OLD liber* 4 and 4.384 *curarum liber*.

**818–19 capit omnia tellus | quae genuit:** cf. Enn. *Ann.* 6–7 Skutsch *terra<que> corpus | quae dedit ipsa capit neque dispendi facit hilum* (with Skutsch); Lucr. 2.999–1000 (quoted at 810–11), 5.319–20 (the sky) *si procreat ex se omnia . . . recipitque perempta*; also Pac. *trag.* 90–1 *omnia animat format alit auget creat | sepelit recipitque in sese omnia. capit* is simple for the compound form *recipit*.

**819 caelo tegitur qui non habet urnam** swerves away from the expected sequel to 818–19, i.e. *legitur quod ab aethere uenit* (Skutsch *ad Enn. Ann.* 6–7). For the thought and expression cf. Sen. *Ep.* 92.35 *ne quis insepultus esset, rerum natura prospexit. quem saeuitia proiecerit, dies condet. diserte Maecenas ait: 'nec tumultum curo. sepelit natura relictos'*; Ov. *Met.* 1.5 *quod tegit omnia caelum. tegitur* puns on 'cover' (*OLD* 1a) and 'bury' (*OLD* 1b). *habere urnam* stands for the proper funeral rites (by synecdoche).

**820–4** Caesar's withdrawal is introduced without warning via a direct, vitriolic apostrophe. At 838–40 birds drop human remains onto Caesarian faces and standards, so it is possible that 820–4 describe Caesar moving from the locale in the fields described at 783 (*ille locus*) back into the camp where the remains fall onto them. However, it is better to take these lines as indicating Caesar's withdrawal from Pharsalus more generally and 838–40 as describing the army on the march: *signa* at 839 makes better sense in the context of an army on the move (cf. *OLD* 10b); in the camp they would be housed in a chapel (the *aedes signorum*).

**820 inhumato funere** 'with their unburied bodies' (*OLD funus* 2a; singular for plural): a variation on the more common phrase *inhumata corpora* (Lucr. 6.1215; Virg. *A.* 11.22).

**821–2** Brief, balanced clauses, enhanced by anaphora, asyndeton and polypoton.

**821 quid fugis hanc cladem?** cf. 9.950 *Caesar, ut Emathia satius clade recessit. quid olentes deseris agros?* cf. Caes. *Civ.* 3.49.2 (reports of the Pompeians at Dyrrachium) *ipsos ualetudine non bona . . . odore taetro ex*



*multitudine cadauerum*; Suet. *Vit.* 10 (the *bon mot* of Vitellius at Bedriacum) *optime olere occisum hostem et melius ciuem*.

**822** *has trahe, Caesar, aquas*: cf. 700 *turbatos incursu sanguinis amnes. trahe* ‘drink’ (*OLD* 7a). **hoc, si potes, utere caelo** ‘breathe this air, if you are able’ (cf. *OLD caelum* 5a, *utor* 2c).

**823–4** The apostrophe concludes with the vivid paradox of rotting corpses routing Caesar and taking possession of the plains in a kind of ersatz victory over him.

**824** *eripiunt* ‘seize’ (*OLD* 2), with emphasis accruing from its enjambed position. **tenent** ‘occupy’ (*OLD* 9a). **uictore fugato** ‘their conquerer put to flight’.

## 825–846 ANIMALS PREY UPON THE DEAD

In epic ‘it is assumed that anyone who dies on the battlefield will be a prey for dogs and birds’ (Macleod 1982: 16). The prospect of the warrior’s body becoming carrion for animals is present from the beginning of the *Iliad* and common thereafter (Hom. *Il.* 1.4–5 αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν | οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι (Achilles) ‘he made them prey for dogs and birds of every kind’; cf. e.g. Virg. *A.* 9.485–6 (his mother to Euryalus) ‘*terra ignota canibus date praeda Latinis | alitibusque iaces*’). While the prospect of being eaten by dogs and birds is ever-present in epic, the current passage is unique in actually describing animals feeding on dead warriors. Lucan’s description divides into two parts: (i) a ‘catalogue’ of carrion animals (Martina 1991: 190–1), proceeding from beasts (825–30) to birds (831–7); and (ii) a description of the effect of their plundering: their inability to carry off their prey (838–40) or even to consume most of it (841–6). In the first section Lucan appears to reverse details found in Lucretius’ description of the victims of the Athenian plague (Lucr. 6.1215–24). There birds and wild animals do not despoil a mass of unburied bodies owing to its rank smell (cf. 826–7) or else they soon perish after tasting the carrion; beasts are moreover noted as not leaving their woods (cf. 836–7). The second section of the scene combines motifs found in Sophocles’ *Antigone* with details from Virg. *A.* 11.721–4 and 12.247–56 (838–40n.).

**825** *Haemonii funesta ad pabula belli* ‘to the deathly fodder of the Thessalian war’. *pabula* describing human remains is a grotesque touch (cf. Ov. *Pont.* 1.2.120 with Gaertner); for *funesta* . . . *pabula* cf. Sen. *Thy.* 750–1 (of Atreus and the children of Thyestes) *auibus epulandos licet | ferisque triste pabulum saeuis trahat*. The adjective *Haemonius* is derived from Haemon, the father of Thessalus, and Haemonia was the older name of Thessaly (Strabo 23); in this context *Haemonii* evokes αἷμα ‘blood’.



**826 Bistonii . . . lupi:** the Bistones were a people who inhabited Thrace (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.8); the adjective may bring to mind the flesh-eating horses of the Bistonian king Diomedes (cf. 2.162–3). Wolves are not proverbial carrion animals, but they plunder human remains at 6.627, 6.553; cf. also Catul. 108.6; Hor. *Epod.* 5.99.

**826–7 tabemque cruentae | caedis odorati** ‘having smelt the putrifying remains of the bloody carnage’. At Lucr. 6.1216–17 birds and beasts shun the smell of the unburied plague victims. The detail has more horror than logic, since the same stench has just driven Caesar away.

**827 Pholoen liquere:** catalogue language, in which places of origin are often cited as being left behind: see Harrison on Virg. *A.* 10.167–8 (cf. 829 *deseruere*). *Pholoen* is a Greek accusative (on Pholoe see 449n.). **leones:** delayed for effect: not an obvious carrion animal. Statius denies that lions will eat dead prey, in contrast to dogs and wolves (*Theb.* 12.739–40 *iuuat exanimis proiectaque praeda canesque | degeneresque lupos, magnos alit ira leones*); on lions in Thrace see Paus. 6.5.4.

**828–30** The next stage (*OLD tunc* 8a) of the ‘catalogue’ is arranged in a tricolon crescendo.

**828–9 obsceni tecta domosque | deseruere canes:** cf. Virg. *G.* 1.470 *obscenaeque canes* (*canis* is common gender), portents of Caesar’s assassination. *obsceni* ‘filthy’ adds to the horror (*OLD* 2; cf. Ov. *F.* 4.936 *turpiaque obscenae . . . exta canis*); adjective and noun enclose the clause. *tecta domosque* for a similar humanizing doublet used of animals cf. Ov. *F.* 3.248 *avis in ramo tecta laremque parat*.

**829–30 et quidquid nare sagaci | aera non sanum motumque cadauere sentit** ‘and whatever keen-scented animal that senses air contaminated and tainted by remains’. This clause is the third subject of *deseruere*. *quidquid* (*OLD* 2a) is ostensibly a cover-all term, but it is difficult not to read the clause as a second reference to dogs: keen-scentedness is their proverbial attribute (e.g. Cic. *Div.* 1.65 *sagire enim sentire acute est; ex quo . . . sagaces dicti canes*) and phrases such as *naris sagax* are elsewhere applied exclusively to dogs. *aera non sanum*: litotes (*aera* is masc. Gk acc. sing.). The present tense of *sentit* describes an ongoing ability. *cadauere* is singular for plural and denotes *tabe* (metonymy).

**831–2 iamque diu uolucres ciuilia castra secutae | conueniunt:** perhaps inspired by the throng of birds that reportedly hovered over Cassius’ camp at Philippi and were taken as an omen of his defeat (Martina 1991: 192 n. 10; cf. Plut. *Brut.* 39.5; cf. App. *BCiv.* 4.134; Cass. Dio 47.14.8); birds of prey following armies on campaign are very commonly attested (e.g. Plut. *Mar.* 17.3; Ael. *NA* 2.46). *conueniunt* ‘converged’ (*OLD* 3a).

**832–4 uos, quae Nilo mutare soletis | Threicias hiemes, ad mollem serius Austrum | istis, aues:** in an apostrophe to the birds themselves, the narrator offers a pseudo-scientific explanation of their prodigious number: their annual migration from Thrace to Egypt has been delayed on account of the feast at Pharsalus. It is clearly a conceit: wrong birds (cranes), wrong season (winter). Lucan knew as much (cf. 3.199–200 and 5.711–16). The point of the explanation lies in their immense (and rowdy) flocks: cf. Arnott 2007 s.v. ‘Geranos’ and e.g. Virg. *A.* 6.311–12 *quam multae glomerantur aues, ubi frigidus annus | trans pontum fugat et terris immittit apricis*. For apostrophe as a means of varying a catalogue see Martina 1991: 191 n. 7. *ad mollem . . . Austrum* ‘to the mild south’ (*OLD mollis* 7b).

**834–5 numquam tanto se uulture caelum | induit aut plures presserunt aera pinnae:** cf. Sen. *Oed.* 604–6 *nec tanta gelidi Strymonis fugiens minas | permutat hiemes ales et caelum secans | tepente Nilo pensat Arctoas niues. tanto se uulture . . . | induit* ‘clothed itself in so vast a number of vultures’ (*OLD* *induo* 4a, *tantus* 5); *uulture* is collective singular (cf. Sen. *Oed.* 604–5 *tanta . . . ales*). *se . . . | induit* is a striking and grotesque extension of a metaphor more commonly applied to trees and their foliage (*TLL* VII<sup>1</sup>.1269.57–63). *presserunt aera* ‘weighed down the air’; the unusual verb was chosen for alliteration.

**836–7 omne nemus misit uolucres omnisque cruenta | alite sanguineis stillauit roribus arbor:** encompassing both the departure of the birds and the effects of their return. Polypeton (*omne . . . omnisque . . .*) and hyperbaton (*omnisque . . . arbor*) hammer home the hyperbole. The personification of  *nemus* as the subject of *misit* contributes to the unsettling image (contrast Stat. *Theb.* 2.522–3 *diraeque etiam fugere uolucres | prodigiale nemus*). *cruenta | alite*: ablative of source. For *sanguineis stillauit roribus arbor* cf. 3.405 (the Massilian grove) *omnisque humanis lustrata cruoribus arbor* (cf. also Virg. *A.* 8.645 *sparsi rorabant sanguine uepres*). For ‘bloody dew’ (describing Medusa’s blood at 9.698) cf. Hom. *Il.* 11.53–4 (Zeus rains down) ἔερσας | αἶματι μυδαλέας ‘dewdrops wet with blood’; the image is then favoured and popularized by Virgil (Tarrant on Virg. *A.* 12.339–40).

**838–40** A lurid, physical reflection of the pollution Caesar has incurred; for blood spilt in civil war as a pollutant see Lennon 2014: 122–33. For the imagery of birds conveying and dropping carrion cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1015–18 (Tiresias to Creon, who denies burial to Polyneices) καὶ ταῦτα τῆς σῆς ἐκ φρενὸς νοσεῖ πόλις. | βωμοὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐσχάροι τε παντελεῖς | πλήρεις ὑπ’ οἰωνῶν τε καὶ κυνῶν βορᾶς | τοῦ δυσμόρου πεπτῶτος Οἰδίπου γόνου (‘and it is your will that has put this plague upon the city; for our altars and our braziers, one and all, are filled with carrion brought by birds and dogs from the

unhappy son of Oedipus who fell'), 1040–1 (Creon to Tiresias) οὐδ' εἰ θεῶν οἱ Ζηνὸς αἰετοὶ βορᾶν | φέρειν νιν ἄρπάζοντες ἐς Διὸς θρόνους 'not even if Zeus' eagles should snatch the body and bear the carrion up to their master's throne!', trans. Lloyd-Jones); Virg. A. 12.247–56, esp. 254–6 (an omen: an eagle attacks a swan and snatches it up into the sky) *donec ui uictus et ipso | pondere defecit praedamque ex unguibus ales | proiecit fluuiio*; cf. also Virg. A. 11.724 (a simile: a falcon kills a dove in flight) *cruor et uulsae labuntur ab aethere plumae*. The detail of carrion falling into someone's face is Lucan's own touch.

**838 uictoris:** a collective singular, to be taken with both *uultus* and *signa*. Lines 838–40 describe the entire column moving away from Pharsalus (cf. 820–4n.). This contact with the blood of their victims aligns them (and especially Caesar) with the *uictores cruenti* of the poem: the Marian at 2.111–12 (cf. 114 (Marius') *pollutae . . . dextrae*), Sulla at 2.156–7; cf. Pompey at 1.330–1 licking Sulla's sword (Caesar's allegation); Pompey had called Caesar a *uictor . . . cruentus* at 5.758. **impia signa:** the standards are *impia* because they are involved in a civil war (cf. 2.286 *summum nefas*). They were sacred objects (48–9n.): their defilement is a shocking detail (cf. *OCD* s.v. 'standards, cult of').

**839 defluxit:** hyperbole; the verb most commonly describes the flow of rivers. Its only other use in *BC* describes a lava flow (6.295).

**840 membraque** 'and limbs', further hyperbole. **deiecit iam lassiss:** the consecutive spondaic feet may mimic the birds' exhausted flight.

**841 sic quoque non omnis populus peruenit ad ossa** 'even so, not all that multitude was reduced to bones' (*OLD* *sic* 9b, *peruenio* 8a, lit. 'to be brought into a specified state or condition'). *populus* without an adjective or defining genitive to describe dead bodies in this world is bold: contrast Stat. *Theb.* 12.22 *itur in exsanguem populum* (*populus* can more commonly denote the shades of the dead in the underworld, cf. *TLL* x<sup>1</sup>.2724.11–20).

**842 inque feras discerptus abit:** very bluntly put: lit. 'and torn to pieces, passed into wild animals'.

**842–4** The subject changes to *ferae*. *curant* is first construed with a direct object (*uiscera*), and then with the infinitive *sorbere*.

**842–3 non intima curant | uiscera** 'they do not desire the innermost organs' (*OLD* *curo* 9): the point is not that they are squeamish, but that they are full.

**844 degustant artus** 'they lightly taste the limbs', a bathetic detail.

**844–5** *Latiae pars maxima turbae* | *fastidita iacet* develops the previous clause and eases the transition to the closural image of the bodies reabsorbed into the environment. *Latiae pars maxima turbae*. *Latiae* . . . *turbae* is a pathetic reminder of the fellow countrymen who comprise the carnage. The phrase offers a devastating answer to Pompey's prayer at 656. *fastidita* 'disdained', recalling *degustant*: the pickings are so rich that even scavenging animals have become fastidious.

**845–6** *quam sol nimbiue diesque* | *longior Emathiis resolutam miscuit aruis*: Lucan suddenly changes temporal perspective to state that the process of the decomposition of the bodies, raised earlier at 810–11 and 818–19, was eventually completed under the influence of time and the natural elements. The switch to the perfect tense contributes to a sense of closure. *diesque* | *longior* 'a considerable passage of time' (*OLD dies* 10; in this sense *dies* is usually feminine). The comparative is rare in this expression; it has been taken not to differ in meaning from the positive and as a metrical convenience (Lanzarone), but *longa dies* itself is often described as a metrical convenience (cf. Horsfall on Virg. A. 6.745) and would be at least as easy to use. *resolutam miscuit* 'dissolved and mingled'; *resolutam* is the equivalent of a coordinate clause. The motif of their dissolution into the plain will be developed further in the apostrophe to Thessaly. *miscuit* agrees in number with *dies*, the last item in the list of subjects. For the dead body rotting in epic cf. Hom. *Od.* 1.161–2 (Telemachus of Odysseus) ἀνέρος, οὗ δὴ που λεύκ' ὅστέα πύθεται ὀμβρῷ | κείμεν' ἐπ' ἠπείρου, ἥ εἰν ἅλι κῦμα κυλίνδει 'of a man whose white bones, it may be, rot in the rain as they lie upon the mainland, or the waves roll them in the sea' (trans. Murray, rev. Dimock), *Il.* 11.934–5 (Diomedes on his conquered foes) ὁ δέ θ' αἵματι γαῖαν ἐρεύθων | πύθεται, οἰωνοὶ δὲ περὶ πλέες ἢ γυναικες 'he, reddening the earth with his blood, rots away, more birds around him than women'; and cf. esp. Virg. *G.* 1.491–2 (quoted below at 847–72n.).

## 847–872 THE APOSTROPHE TO THESSALY

The poem's concentration upon the site of the battle, which had begun with the Thessalian excursus at 6.333–412, now comes to an end with an apostrophe that serves as an epilogue to book 7. For the closural strategy of a lengthy apostrophe cf. 4.799–824, where the dead Curio is denounced, and 8.823–34, where the narrator condemns and curses Egypt following Pompey's death, an apostrophe that begins the final section of book 8. Both Curio and Egypt are vigorously indicted, but the tone of the present apostrophe is more nuanced. Thessaly's guilt is certainly to the fore but she also appears as an unfortunate victim of divine punishment (847–9);

her guilt is ultimately relativized and (at least rhetorically) negated by the subsequent spread of civil war (870–2).

The most important model for the apostrophe is Virg. *G.* 1.491–7 *nec fuit indignum superis bis sanguine nostro | Emathiam et latos Haemi pinguescere campos. | scilicet et tempus ueniet, cum finibus illis | agricola incuruo terram molitus aratro | exesa inueniet scabra robigine pila, | aut grauibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanes | grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris*. Lucan adopts the details of blood steeping the plain (854) and fertilizing fields (851, 865), and of ploughing human remains (852, 858–9). He denies any geographical containment of the battle and its guilt (869–72; cf. Virg. *G.* 1.493 *finibus illis*). Virgil follows his passage with a prayer that Octavian not be prevented from saving an age in ruins (*G.* 500–1 *hunc . . . euerso iuuenem succurrere saeclo | ne prohibete*); Lucan's prayer only serves to demonstrate the shared, worldwide guilt of civil war.

The apostrophe proceeds through four sections: (i) 847–52: the narrator asks how Thessaly deserved so many deaths and what passage of time will suffice to forgive it; the carnage at the site is still signalled by discoloured crops and bones turned up by ploughs; (ii) 853–9: a second battle will occur there; the site contains more dead than all ancestral tombs put together; (iii) 860–8: Thessaly would have been abandoned altogether had it been the only site of a civil war battle; (iv) 869–72: the narrator prays that the odium of civil war might be directed at such sites, but the spread of civil war condemns the whole world and absolves Thessaly of its special guilt.

**847–9 Thessalia, infelix, quo tantum crimine, tellus, | laesisti superos, ut te tot mortibus unam, | tot scelerum fatis premerent?** cf. 8.827 (the narrator to Egypt) *quid tibi, saeua, precer pro tanto crimine, tellus?* (Lanzarone). The disrupted word order of the main clause may be taken to reflect the heightened emotions of the speaker, while the result clause gains emphasis and rhetorical weight from the paired ablatives (of means), *tot mortibus . . . | tot scelerum fatis*, in which theme and variation are enhanced by anaphora. **Thessalia, infelix . . . tellus:** cf. 8.823 *noxia ciuili tellus Aegyptia fato*. **tantum** modifies *laesisti*. **scelerum fatis:** *scelerum* is genitive of definition (*NLS* §72 (5)); the meaning is either 'destined crimes' or 'criminal deaths' (lit. 'deaths consisting in crime'). **premerent** 'afflict' (*OLD* 8a).

**849–50 quod sufficit aeuum | inmemor ut donet belli tibi damna uetustas?** 'What passage of time is sufficient for a far-off age to forget and forgive you the losses of this war?' (*OLD* *dono* 5b); for *uetustas* of posterity cf. Cic. *Mil.* 98 *de me . . . nulla unquam obmutescet uetustas*. The express purpose of Lucan's poetic project is to ensure that no such moment of

oblivion shall ever come to pass: cf. 9.986–7 *Pharsalia nostra | uiuet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aeuo*.

**851–9** For the influence of Virg. G. 1.489–92 upon these lines see 847–72n.

**851** According to Plutarch (*Mar.* 21.3), the notion that the dead fertilized the fields on which they had been killed was as old as Archilochus (see N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.29 *pinguior*); for a contemporary example cf. Petr. 120.98–9 *horrida tellus | extulit in lucem nutritas sanguine fruges*. Here the topos is made a hyperbole by the conceit that future crops will be discoloured by the blood which fertilizes them. **herba** ‘shoots’ (TLL VI.2622.57–2623.28), cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.452 *primis segetes moriuntur in herbis*.

**852 quo non . . . uiolabis uomere:** i.e. there is no area on the plain where ploughing would not disturb the dead. The motif will be reprised at 858–9.

**853 ante** ‘before that’ (*OLD* 3b), i.e. before the crops grow through and the dead are disturbed by ploughing. **nouae . . . acies:** those of Brutus and Cassius, and Antony and Octavian at Philippi in 42 BCE (for the assimilation of the two battle sites see 592n.).

**853–4 scelerique secundo | praestabis nondum siccos hoc sanguine campos:** cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.823–4 *Pharsalia sentiet illum, | Emathiiue iterum madaefient caede Philippi* (in addition to Virg. G. 1.489–90). *nondum siccos hoc sanguine campos:* six years elapsed between the two battles. The hyperbole is if anything toned down from Man. 1.910–11 *uixque etiam sicca miles Romanus harena | ossa uirum lacerosque prius super astitit artus*.

**855** Desecrating ancestral tombs offers a shocking point of comparison for the scale of the casualties and points to the moral depravity of the crime of civil war. The bones which in Virgil had astonishing size (G. 1.492 *grandiaque . . . mirabitur ossa*) are here given incomprehensible number. **uertamus . . . licebit** ‘though we overturn’: a concession (*OLD licet* 4a; NLS §248); the tense does not differ in meaning from the present (cf. Hor. *Epod.* 15.19 with Watson).

**856–7** Two clauses of increasing length and complexity in apposition to *busta* (supply *eos* before *qui*). These add weight to *busta* by breaking it up into separate groups (*distributio*). **radice uetusta | . . . uictis compagibus** ‘their mortar joints overcome by ancient roots’ (*OLD compages* 2a). The hyperbaton lends emphasis to the ancient roots, which similarly mark Troy’s antiquity at 9.967–8 *templa deorum | iam lassa radice tenent*.

**858–9** reprise the details of Virg. *G.* 1.493–7 (see 847–72n.) by way of Ov. *Ep.* 1.55–6 (Penelope on the plains of Troy) *semisepulta uirum curuis feriuntur aratris | ossa*.

**858 plus cinerum** ‘more remains’ (*OLD* 4a ‘ashes as the condition of the body after death (whether cremated or not)’). **Haemoniae . . . telluris:** suggesting ‘bloody land’ (< αἷμα ‘blood’).

**859** A golden line (AaVbB) rounds off the period. **ruricolis . . . dentibus:** cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.6.1 *ruricolae . . . aratri*. For *dens* used of the plough cf. Virg. *G.* 1.261–2 *durum proculdit arator | uomeris obtunsi dentem*.

**860–8** A lengthy contrary-to-fact conditional sentence: the protasis (868 *si . . . tulisses*) is in past time. Of the six apodoses, the first two are in past time (860 *religasset*, 861 *mouisset*), the remaining four refer to the present (862 *fugerent*, 863 *carerent*, 864 *auderet*, 867 *iaceres*).

**860 ab Emathio religasset litore funem** ‘would have secured his rope to the Emathian shore’, varying the standard expression for ‘moor’ (*OLD* *relo* 3b; cf. Virg. *A.* 7.106 *gramineo ripae religauit ab aggere classem*) and perhaps punning on ἡμαθόεις ‘sandy’. *religasset* is the syncopated form of the pluperfect *religauisset*. For the construction *a/ab* with verbs of binding see *TLL* 1.17.8–25.

**861 terram . . . mouisset:** for *moueo* of ploughing cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.102–3 *motaque iubet supponere terrae | uipereos dentes*. **arator:** a better reading with the agent nouns *nauita*, *coloni* and *pastor* (**Ω** *aratro* **Z<sup>2</sup>PV**).

**862 Romani bustum populi:** in apposition to 861 *terram*; cf. Catul. 68.89 *Troia (nefas!) commune sepulcrum Asiae Europaeque*; Prop. 2.1.27 *ciuilia busta, Philippos*.

**862–3 fugerentque coloni | umbrarum campos:** cf. 1.582–3 *tollentemque caput gelidas Anienis ad undas | agricolae fracto Marium fugere sepulchro*. Spondees emphasise the haunted plains.

**863 gregibus dumeta carerent** ‘the thickets would be devoid of flocks’, i.e. animals would not graze there (cf. Virg. *G.* 1.15 *tondent dumeta iuuenci*).

**864–5** This clause explains the one preceding it (cf. *OLD* -*que* 6a).

**864 pecori permittere pastor:** triple alliteration at the end of the line, a venerable device (Hardie on Virg. *A.* 9.563 with references).

**865 surgentem de nostris ossibus herbam:** cf. 851 *quae seges infecta surget non decolor herba?* Alliteration at the metrical ictus (*nóstris óssibus*) adds emphasis to the gruesome detail.



**866–7** ‘and, as if not enduring human beings (whether because of the path of the blazing sun or of ice), you would lie, bare and unknown’. The earth is conceived of as a sphere, divided into five zones; of these, the outer two and the middle are uninhabitable owing to excessive cold and heat respectively (see Virg. *G.* 1.233–7 with Mynors on 1.233; N–H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.22.22 with references). **solis iniqui | limite**: the oppressively hot equatorial zone, inhospitable to human life and crossed annually by the sun: cf. Virg. *G.* 1.233–4 *corusco | semper sole rubens et torrida semper ab igni*, A. 7.228 *plaga solis iniqui* (Servius: *intemperati uel ardentis*). *limes* refers to the path of the sun (*TLL* VII<sup>2</sup>.1411.22–41).

**867 glacie**: cf. Virg. *G.* 1.236 *glacie concretae atque imbribus atris*. A compendious comparison: *uel limitibus glaciei*. **nuda** ‘deserted’ (*OLD* 9b); cf. 2.90 (Marius) *nuda triumphati iacuit per regna Iugurthae*. **iaceres** ‘you would lie’ (in the sense ‘in a specific state or condition’, *OLD* 13).

**868 si non prima nefas belli sed sola tulisses** ‘if you had been not the first, but the only land to have endured the crime of war’ (*OLD fero* 16). This neat rhetorical antithesis plainly ignores the fact that Thessaly was not the first (there were prior civil battles fought at Ilerda and Dyrrachium), but she is framed as such relative to the subsequent battles listed at 871–2. The main point is that she was not the last.

**869 o superi**: the apostrophe to Thessaly ends and Lucan makes a final, hopeless appeal to the gods that humans be allowed to attribute the odium of civil war to specific sites such as Pharsalus. Lucan and his readers are unable to hate ‘guilty lands’ because every land is tainted with the same sin (cf. 1.6 *in commune nefas*).

**870** The subsequent proliferation of civil war battle sites spread the guilt and robbed sites such as Pharsalus of their exceptional culpability. The idea is expressed in hyperbole (the whole world) and as a paradox in which incrimination and absolution are equated (the logic of the paradox is made plain at 871–2). Anaphora and asyndeton lend urgency and emotion. **premitis** ‘burden’ (*OLD* 13), *sc.* with crime: often used of the accused in judicial contexts (*TLL* X<sup>2</sup>.1177.59–72).

**871–2** For other lists of civil war battles in the poem see 1.38–43, the *matrona*’s vision at 1.678–94, 6.306–13.

**871 Hesperiae clades**: most likely Munda, the final battle of this civil war (cf. 1.40 *ultima funesta concurrant proelia Munda*): 692n. For *Hesperius* of Spain cf. *OLD* 2a and 4.352. The less likely alternative is Octavian’s siege of L. Antonius at Perugia in February 41, which is only explicitly cited at 1.41 *Perusina fames*. The executions in the aftermath of the siege became notorious. For sources on both battles see Roche on 1.40 and



1.41. **Pachyni:** the south-eastern promontory of Sicily (Barrington 47G5). It refers, by metonymy, to Sicily and denotes Naulochus, located on the island's north-east coast (Barrington 47G2). For a comparably distant metonymy cf. 10.9 *Paraetoniā . . . urbem* for Alexandria: Paraetonium is on the border of Egypt and Libya. The naval battle near Naulochus took place on 3 September 36: the Caesarian fleet, commanded by Agrippa, defeated the fleet of Sextus Pompeius. **flebilis:** 691n.

**872 Mutina:** two bloody attempts (14 and 21 April 43) by armies under the command of the year's consuls Hirtius and Pansa, assisted by Octavian, to lift Antony's siege of D. Brutus at Mutina. Both consuls died in the encounter; Octavian returned to Rome with the armies and assumed his first consulship. **Leucas:** Octavian's defeat of Antony and Cleopatra at Actium (2 September 31), named for the nearby promontory of Leucas or its chief city (Barrington 54C4); cf. 1.42–3 *quas premit aspera classes | Leucas*. **puros fecere Philippos:** cf. *ASL: societate sui . . . criminis copulata* ('by the close association of their crime'). *puros* 'free from moral defilement, blameless' (*OLD* 4). *Philippos*: i.e. Pharsalus (as at Virg. *G.* 1.490; Luc. 1.680). Alliteration and assonance in the final three words (*puros fecere Philippos*) adds to the sense of closure.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Adams, J. N. 1973. 'Two Latin words for "kill"', *Glotta* 51: 280–92
- Ahl, F. 1976. *Lucan: an introduction*, Cornell
- Albertus, J. 1908. *Die parakletikoi in der Griechischen und römischen Literatur*, Strassbourg
- Albrecht, M. von 1970. 'Der Dichter Lucan und die epische Tradition' in O. Reverdin, ed. *Lucain* (Vandoeuvres) 267–301
1999. *A history of Roman literature: from Livius Andronicus to Boethius: with special regard to its influence on world literature*, rev. G. Schmeling and M. von Albrecht, Leiden
- Ambühl, A. 2015. *Krieg und Bürgerkrieg bei Lucan und in der griechischen Literatur: Studien zur Rezeption der attischen Tragödie und der hellenistischen Dichtung im Bellum civile*, Berlin
- Anderson, R. D., P. J. Parsons and R. G. M. Nisbet 1979. 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrim', *JRS* 69: 125–55
- Anderson, W. B. 1927. 'Housman's Lucan', *CR* 41: 26–33
- Andronikos, M. 1968. *Totenkult*, Göttingen
- Anzinger, S. 2007. *Schweigen im römischen Epos: zur Dramaturgie der Kommunikation bei Vergil, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus und Statius*, Berlin
- Armstrong, A. H. 1947. *An introduction to ancient philosophy*, London
- Arnott, W. G. 2007. *Birds in the ancient world from A to Z*, Abingdon
- Asso, P. ed. 2011. *Brill's companion to Lucan*, Leiden
- Austin, R. G. 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus*, Oxford
1977. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus*, Oxford
- Axelsson, B. 1945. *Unpoetische Wörter: ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, Lund
1959. 'Eine Korruptel in der Überlieferung des Lukan', in H. Dahlmann and R. Merkelbach, eds. *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik* (Cologne) 31–5
- Babltitz, L. 2007. *Actors and audience in the Roman courtroom*, London
- Bachofen, A. 1972. 'Cäsars und Lucans *Bellum civile*. ein Inhaltsvergleich', diss., Zürich
- Badali, R. 1973. 'I codici romani di Lucano', *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione dell'edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* 21: 3–47
- Badian, E. 1955. 'The date of Pompey's first triumph', *Hermes* 83: 107–18
- Bailey, C. 1947. *Titi Lucreti De rerum natura*, 3 vols., Oxford
- Barchiesi, A. 2001. *Speaking volumes: narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets*, London
- Bartsch, S. 1997. *Ideology in cold blood: a reading of Lucan's Civil war*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Beck, I. 1984. *Ares in Vasenmalerei Relief und Rundplastik*, Frankfurt

- Béranger, J. 1953. *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat*, Basel
- Bernstein, N. W. 2011. 'The dead and their ghosts in the *Bellum civile*: Lucan's visions of history', in Asso 2011: 257–79
- Bobzien, S. 1998. *Determinism and freedom in Stoic philosophy*, Oxford
- Bonner, S. F. 1966. 'Lucan and the declamation schools', *AJPh* 87: 257–89; repr. in Tesoriero 2010: 69–106
- Boyle, A. J. 2006. *An introduction to Roman tragedy*, London
- Bradley, D. R. 1969. 'Some textual problems in Lucan book vii', *Latomus* 28: 175–85
- Bramble, J. C. 1983. 'Lucan', in E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen, eds. *The Cambridge history of classical literature*, vol. II: *Latin literature* (Cambridge) 533–57
- Braund, D. 1984. *Rome and the friendly king: the character of the client kingship*, London
- Braund, S. 1992. 'Introduction', in S. Braund, trans. *Lucan: Civil war*, Oxford
- Braund, S., and G. Gilbert 2003. 'An ABC of epic *ira*: anger, beasts, and cannibalism', in S. Braund and G. W. Most, eds. *Ancient anger: perspectives from Homer to Galen* (Cambridge) 250–85
- Breed, B. 2006. *Pastoral inscriptions: reading and writing Virgil's Eclogues*, London
- Brennan, T. 2003. 'Stoic moral psychology', in Inwood 2003: 257–94
- Brink, C. O. 1982. *Horace on poetry: Epistles Book II. The letters to Augustus and Florus*, Cambridge
- Bruère, R. T. 1951a. 'Lucan's Cornelia', *CPh* 46: 221–36
- 1951b. 'Palaeopharsalus, Pharsalus, Pharsalia', *CPh* 46: 111–15
- Burkert, W. 1972. *Love and science in ancient Pythagoreanism*, trans. E. L. Minar, Cambridge, Mass.
- Cairns, F. 1989. *Virgil's Augustan epic*, Cambridge
- Cancik, H. 1970. 'Ein Traum des Pompeius', in W. Rutz, ed. *Lucan* (Darmstadt) 546–52
- Casali, S. 2011. 'The *Bellum civile* as an anti-Aeneid', in Asso 2011: 81–111
- Champlin, E. 2003. 'Agamemnon at Rome: Roman dynasts and Greek heroes', in S. Braund and C. Gill, eds. *Myth, history and culture in republican Rome: studies in honour of T. P. Wiseman* (Exeter) 295–315
- Chaudhuri, P. 2014. *The war with god: theomachy in Roman imperial poetry*, Oxford
- Clausen, W. 1994. *Virgil: Eclogues*, Oxford
- Coarelli, F. 2007. *Rome and environs: an archaeological guide*, Berkeley
- Coffee, N. 2009. *The commerce of war: exchange and social order in Latin epic*, Chicago

2011. 'Social relations in Lucan's *Bellum civile*', in Asso 2011: 417–32
- Coleman, R. 1975. 'Greek influences on Latin syntax', *TPhS* 74: 101–56
- Conrad, C. 1965. 'Traditional patterns of word-order in Latin epic from Ennius to Vergil', *HSCPh* 69: 195–258
- Cornell, T. J., ed. 2013. *The fragments of the Roman historians*, Oxford
- Cowan, R. 2011. 'Hopefully surviving: despair and the limits of *devotio* in Virgil and others', *PVS* 27: 56–98
- D'Alessandro Behr, F. 2007. *Feeling history: Lucan, Stoicism, and the poetics of passion*, Columbus, OH
- Day, H. J. M. 2013. *Lucan and the sublime: power, representation and aesthetic experience*, Cambridge
- De Lacey, P. 1948. 'Stoic views of poetry', *AJPh* 69: 241–71
- Dick, B. F. 1967. '*Fatum* and *Fortuna* in Lucan', *CPh* 62: 235–42
- Dinter, M. T. 2012. *Anatomizing civil war: studies in Lucan's epic technique*, Ann Arbor
- Dräger, A. 1874. *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*, Leipzig
- Duckworth, G. E. 1967. 'Five centuries of Latin hexameter poetry: silver age to late empire', *TAPhA* 98: 77–150
1969. *Vergil and the classical hexameter poetry*, Ann Arbor
- Due, O. S. 1962. 'An essay on Lucan', *C&M* 23: 68–132
1970. 'Lucain et la philosophie', in M. Durry, ed. *Lucain*. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 15 (Geneva) 203–32
- Duff, J. D. 1928. *Lucan: The civil war, books 1–x (Pharsalia)*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Earnshaw, K. M. 2013. '(First-)Beginnings and (never-) endings in Lucan and Lucretius', in D. Lehoux, A. D. Morrison and A. Sharrock, eds. *Lucretius: poetry, philosophy, science* (Oxford) 261–84
- Easton, S. 2011. 'Envy and fame in Lucan's *Bellum civile*', in Asso 2011: 345–62
- Eckstein, A. 1981. 'The foundation day of Roman coloniae', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 12: 85–98
- Espósito, P. 2011. 'Early and medieval *scholia* and *commentaria* on Lucan', in Asso 2011: 453–63
- Fantham, E. 1992. 'Lucan's Medusa-excursus: its design and purpose', *MD* 29: 95–119
1995. 'The ambiguity of *virtus* in Lucan's *Civil war* and Statius' *Thebaid*', *Arachnion* 1.3, [www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num3/fantham.html](http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num3/fantham.html)
1999. 'Lucan and the republican senate: ideology, historical record and prosopography', in P. Espósito and L. Nicastrì, eds. *Interpretare Lucano: miscellanea di studi* (Naples) 109–25
2003. 'The angry poet and the angry gods: problems of theodicy in Lucan's epic of defeat', in Braund and Most 2003: 229–49

- Feeney, D. C. 1986a. 'History and revelation in Vergil's underworld', *PCPhS* 32: 1–24
- 1986b. '*Stat Magni nominis umbra*: Lucan on the greatness of Pompeius Magnus', *CQ* 36: 239–43; repr. in Tesoriero 2010: 346–54
1991. *The gods in epic: poets and critics of the classical tradition*, Oxford
2010. '*Stat magni nominis umbra*: Lucan on the greatness of Pompeius Magnus', in Tesoriero 2010: 346–54 (reprint with additions of Feeney 1986b)
2011. 'Roman historiography and epic', in J. Rüpke, ed. *A companion to Roman religion* (Malden, Mass.) 129–42
- Fishwick, D. 1967. '*Hastiferi*', *JRS* 57: 142–60
- Fontenrose, J. 1959. *Python: a study of Delphic myth and its origins*, Berkeley
- Fowler, D. P. 1997 'Second thoughts on closure', in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn and D. Fowler, eds. *Classical closure: reading the end in Greek and Latin literature* (Princeton) 3–22
- Fraenkel, E. 1926. 'Lucan, ed. A. E. Housman', *Gnomon* 2: 497–532
2010. 'Lucan as the transmitter of ancient pathos', trans. L. Holford-Strevens; repr. in Tesoriero 2010: 15–45
- Francken, C. M. 1890. *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*, Lyons
- Friedrich, W. H. 2010. 'Cato, Caesar and Fortune in Lucan', trans. L. Holford-Strevens; repr. in Tesoriero 2010: 369–410
- Fucecchi, M. 2011. 'Partisans in civil war', in Asso 2011: 237–56
- Gabba, E. 1976. *Republican Rome: the army and the allies*, Berkeley
- Gagliardi, D. 1975. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis liber VII*, Florence
1985. 'La letteratura dell'irrazionale in età neroniana', in *ANRW* II.32.3: 2047–65
- Galán Vioque, G. 2002. *Martial, book VII: a commentary*, Leiden
- Galinsky, K. 1988. 'The anger of Aeneas', *AJPh* 109: 321–48
- Gall, D. 2005. 'Masse, Heere und Feldherren in Lucans Pharsalia', in C. Walde, ed. *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert / Lucan in the 21st century* (Munich) 89–110
- Ganiban, R. T. 2007. *Statius and Virgil: the Thebaid and the reinterpretation of the Aeneid*, Cambridge
- Gelzer, M. 1969. *The Roman nobility*, trans. R. Seager (Oxford)
- Gibson, B. 2008. 'Battle narrative in Statius, *Thebaid*', in J. J. L. Smolenaars, H. van Dam and R. R. Nauta, eds. *The poetry of Statius* (Leiden) 85–109
- Ginsburg, L. D. 2017. *Staging memory, staging strife: empire and civil war in the Octavia*, Oxford
- Glaesser, R. 1984. *Verbrechen und Verblendung: Untersuchung zum Furor-Begriff bei Lucan mit Berücksichtigung der Tragödien Senecas*, Frankfurt am Main
- Goebel, G. H. 1981. 'Rhetorical and poetical thinking in Lucan's harangues (7.250–382)', *TAPhA* 111: 79–94

- Gorman, V. 2001. 'Lucan's epic "aristeia" and the hero of the *Bellum civile*', *CJ* 96: 263–90
- Gotoff, H. C. 1971. *The transmission of the text of Lucan in the ninth century*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Gowing, A. 2005. *Empire and memory: the representation of the Roman republic in imperial culture*, Cambridge
- Griffin, M. T. 1984. *Nero: the end of a dynasty*, London
- Grillo, L. 2012. *The art of Caesar's Bellum civile: literature, ideology and community*, Cambridge
- Gruen, E. 1984. *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*, 2 vols., Berkeley
- Gwatkin, W. E. 1956. 'Some reflections on the Battle of Pharsalus', *TAPhA* 87: 109–24
- Håkanson, L. 1979. 'Problems of textual criticism and interpretation in Lucan's *De bello civili*', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 25: 26–51
1982. 'Miscellanea critica', *Phoenix* 36: 237–42
- Handford, S. A. 1947. *The Latin subjunctive: its uses and development from Plautus to Tacitus*, London
- Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: cosmos and imperium*, Oxford
1987. 'Ships and ship-names in the *Aeneid*', in M. Whitby, P. Hardie and M. Whitby, eds. *Homo viator: classical essays for John Bramble* (Bristol) 163–72
1993. *The epic successors of Virgil: a study in the dynamics of a tradition*, Cambridge
1994. *Virgil: Aeneid book IX*, Cambridge
1997. 'Closure in Latin epic', in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn and D. Fowler, eds. *Classical closure: reading the end in Greek and Latin literature* (Princeton) 139–62
2009. *Lucretian receptions: history, the sublime, knowledge*, Cambridge
2012. *Rumour and renown: representations of fama in Western literature*, Cambridge
2013. 'Lucan's *Bellum civile*', in E. Buckley and M. Dinter, eds. *A companion to the Neronian age* (Malden, Mass.) 225–40
- Harris, W. V. 2009. *Dreams and experience in classical antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Harrison, J. 2013. *Dreams and dreaming in the Roman empire: cultural memory and imagination*, London
- Harrison, S. J. 1991. *Virgil: Aeneid 10*, Oxford
2006. 'The epic and monuments: interactions between Virgil's *Aeneid* and the Augustan building programme', in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie and R. O. A. M. Lyne, eds. *Epic interactions: perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the epic tradition* (Oxford) 159–84
- Heitland, W. E. 1887. 'Introduction', in C. E. Haskins, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia* (Cambridge) xiii–cxxx

- Helgeland, P. 1978. 'Roman army religion', in *ANRW* II.16.2: 1470–1555
- Henderson, J. 1987. 'Lucan/the word at war', *Ramus* 16: 122–64; repr. in Tesoriero 2010: 433–92
- Hengel, M. 1977. *Crucifixion*, London
- Hershkowitz, D. 1998. *The madness of epic*, Oxford
- Heyworth, S. J. 2007. *Cynthia: a companion to the text of Propertius*, Oxford
- Heyworth, S. J., and J. H. W. Morwood 2011. *A commentary on Propertius book 3*, Oxford
- Hickson-Hahn, F. V. 1999. 'Vergilian transformation of an oath ritual: *Aeneid* 12.169–174, 213–215', *Vergilius* 45: 22–38
- Hill, D. E. 1985. *Ovid: Metamorphoses I–IV*, Warminster
- Hill, T. 2004. *Ambitiosa mors: suicide and self in Roman thought and literature*, New York
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and intertext: dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*, Cambridge
2000. 'Essential epic: genre and gender from Macer to Statius', in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of genre: authors, canons, and society* (Cambridge) 221–44
- Hodges, G. W. Q. 2004. 'Ethnographic characterization in Lucan's *Bellum civile*', diss., Ohio
- Holliday, V. 1969. *Pompey in Cicero's correspondence and Lucan's Civil war*, Paris
- Hollis, A. S. 2007. *Fragments of Roman poetry c. 60 BC – AD 20*, Oxford
- Holmes, T. R. 1909. 'Appian, *BC* ii 74', *CR* 23: 254–5
- Horsfall, N. 1990. 'The *Aeneid* and the social structure of primitive Italy', *Athenaeum* 78: 523–7
1995. *A companion to the study of Virgil*, Leiden
2000. *Virgil: Aeneid 7. A commentary*, Leiden
2003. *Virgil: Aeneid 11. A commentary*, Leiden
2006. *Virgil: Aeneid 3. A commentary*, Leiden
2008. *Virgil: Aeneid 2. A commentary*, Leiden
- Housman, A. E. 1910. 'Astrology in Dracontius', *CQ* 4: 191–5
1919. 'Notes on Martial', *CQ* 13: 68–80
1921. 'Lucan vii 460–465', *CQ* 15: 172–4
- Hübner, U. 1976. 'Der Sonnenaufgang vor Pharsalus: zu Lucan 7, 1–3', *Philologus* 120: 107–16
- Hudson-Williams, A. 1954. 'Notes on Lucan, book 7', *CQ* 4: 187–93
1959. 'Imitative echoes and textual criticism', *CQ* 9: 61–72
- Hunink, V. 1992. *M. Annaeus Lucanus: Bellum civile book III. A commentary*, Amsterdam
- Hutchinson, G. O. 2006. *Propertius: Elegies book IV*, Cambridge
- Huttner, U. 2004. *Recusatio imperii: ein politisches Ritual zwischen Ethik und Taktik*, Hildesheim



- Ingleheart, J. 2010. *A commentary on Ovid: Tristia, book 2*, Oxford
- Inwood, B., 1985. *Ethics and human action in early Stoicism*, Oxford  
ed. 2003. *The Cambridge companion to Stoicism*, Cambridge
- Jal, P. 1963. *La guerre civile à Rome: étude littéraire et morale*, Paris
- Johnson, W. R. 1987. *Momentary monsters: Lucan and his heroes*, Cornell
- Jones, A. 2003. 'The Stoics and the astronomical sciences', in Inwood  
2003: 328–44
- Kaster, R. A. 2002. 'The taxonomy of patience, or when is "*patientia*" not  
a virtue?', *CPh* 97: 133–44  
2005. *Emotion, restraint and community in ancient Rome*, Oxford
- Kenney, E. J. 2014. *Lucretius: De rerum natura book III*, 2nd edn, Cambridge
- Kidd, D. A. 1966. 'Lucan vii 423–5', *Mnemosyne* 19: 42–5
- Klotz, A., ed. 1953. *Scaenicorum Romanorum fragmenta*, Munich
- Konrad, C. F. 1994. *Plutarch's Sertorius: a historical commentary*, Chapel Hill  
2004. 'Vellere signa', in C. F. Conrad, ed. *Augusto augurio: rerum  
humanarum et diuinarum commentationes in honorem Jerzy Linderski*  
(Wiesbaden) 169–203
- Konstan, D. 2015. 'Senecan emotions', in S. Bartsch and A. Schiesaro,  
eds. *The Cambridge companion to Seneca* (Cambridge) 174–84
- Kraus, C. S. 1994. *Livy: Ab urbe condita book VI*, Cambridge
- Lapidge, M. 1979. 'Lucan's imagery of cosmic dissolution', *Hermes* 107:  
344–70; repr. in Tesoriero 2010: 289–323
- Lateiner, D. 1990. 'Mimetic syntax: metaphor from word order, especially  
in Ovid', *AJPh* 111: 204–37
- Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbook of literary rhetoric: a foundation for literary  
study*, trans. M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen and D. E. Orton, ed. D. E. Orton  
and R. D. Anderson, Leiden
- Lausberg, M. 1985. 'Lucan und Homer', in *ANRW* II.32.3: 1565–1622
- Lebek, W. D. 1976. *Lucans Pharsalia: Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug*,  
Göttingen
- Leigh, M. 1997a. *Lucan: spectacle and engagement*, Oxford  
1997b. 'Varius Rufus, Thyestes and the appetites of Antony', *PCPhS* 42:  
171–97
- Lennon, J. L. 2014. *Pollution and religion in ancient Rome*, Cambridge
- Lesky, A. 2001. 'Divine and human causation in Homeric epic', in D. L.  
Cairns, ed. *Oxford readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford) 170–202
- Levick, B. 2015. *Catiline*, London
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 1979. *Continuity and change in Roman religion*,  
Oxford
- Lintott, A. W. 1971. 'Lucan and the history of the civil war', *CQ* 21:  
488–505
- Long, A. A. 2006. *From Epicurus to Epictetus: studies in Hellenistic and Roman  
philosophy*, Oxford

- Long, A. A., and D. N. Sedley 1987. *The Hellenistic philosophers*, 2 vols., Cambridge
- Lounsbury, R. C. 1975. 'The death of Domitius in the *Pharsalia*', *TAPhA* 105: 209–12
1976. 'History and motive in book seven of Lucan's *Pharsalia*', *Hermes* 104: 210–39
- Lovano, M. 2002. *The age of Cinna: crucible of late-republican Rome*, Stuttgart
- Lovatt, H. 2013. *The epic gaze: vision, gender and narrative in ancient epic*, Cambridge
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1978. *Ciris: a poem attributed to Vergil*, Cambridge
1989. *Words and the poet: characteristic techniques of style in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford
- Mackay, L. A. 1952. 'Pharsalus and the Roman fate', *Phoenix* 6: 147–50
1961. 'The vocabulary of fear in Latin poetry', *TAPhA* 92: 308–16
- Macleod, C. 1982. *Homer: Iliad book xxiv*, Cambridge
- Malamud, M. 2003. 'Pompey's head and Cato's snakes', *CPh* 98: 31–44
- Malcovati, E. 1953. 'Lucano e Cicerone', *Athenaeum* 31: 288–97
- Maltby, R. 1991. *A lexicon of ancient Latin etymologies*, Leeds
- Marks, R. 2009. 'Silius and Lucan', in A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's companion to Silius Italicus* (Leiden) 127–53
- Marti, B. 1945. 'The meaning of the *Pharsalia*', *AJPh* 66: 352–76
1964. 'Tragic history and Lucan's *Pharsalia*', in C. Henderson, ed. *Classical, mediaeval and renaissance studies in honour of Berthold Louis Ullman*, vol. 1 (Rome) 165–204
1970. 'La structure de la Pharsale', in M. Durry, ed. *Lucain. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* 15 (Geneva) 3–38
- Martina, M. 1991. 'Lucano, *Bellum civile* 7.825–846', *MD* 26: 189–92
- Martindale, C. 1976. 'Paradox, hyperbole and literary novelty in Lucan's *De bello civili*', *BICS* 23: 45–54
1984. 'The politician Lucan', *Greece & Rome* 31: 64–79
- Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and civil war in Lucan's Bellum civile*, Cambridge
1994. 'Deceiving the reader: the political mission of Lucan *Bellum civile* 7', in J. Elsner and J. Masters, eds. *Reflections of Nero: culture, history, and representation* (Chapel Hill) 151–77
- Matthews, M. 2008. *Caesar and the storm: a commentary on Lucan, De bello civili, book 5, lines 476–721*, New York
- Maxfield, V. A. 1981. *The military decorations of the Roman army*, Berkeley
- Mayer, R. 1979. '*Pharsalica damna*', *Mnemosyne* 32: 338–59
1981. *Lucan: Civil war viii*, Warminster
- McRoberts, S. S. 2005. 'Lucan's war on Caesar', diss., Wisconsin
- Miura, Y. 1981. 'Zur Funktion der Gleichnisse im I. und VII. Buch von Lucans *Pharsalia*', *GB* 10: 207–32

- Morgan, J. D. 1983. 'Palaepharsalus: the battle and the town', *AJPh* 87: 23–54
- Morgan, L. 1999. *Patterns of redemption in Virgil's Georgics*, Cambridge
- Most, G. W. 1992. 'Disiecti membra poetae: the rhetoric of dismemberment in Neronian poetry', in R. Selden and D. Hexter, eds. *Innovations in antiquity* (New York) 391–419
- Myers, K. S. 2009. *Ovid: Metamorphoses XIV*, Cambridge
- Mynors, R. A. B. 1990. *Vergil: Georgics*, Oxford
- Narducci, E. 1979. *La provvidenza crudele: Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei*, Pisa
2002. *Lucano: un'epica contro l'impero*, Bari
2003. 'Cicerone nella "Pharsalia" di Lucano', in E. Narducci, ed. *Aspetti della fortuna di Cicerone nella cultura latina. Atti del III Symposium Ciceronianum Arpinas* (Florence) 78–91
- Nehrkorn, H. 1960. 'Die Darstellung und Funktion der Nebencharaktere in Lucans *Bellum civile*', diss., Baltimore
- Nelis, D., L. Galli Milić and V. Berlincourt, eds. 2016. *Lucan and Claudian: context and intertext*, Heidelberg
- Newlands, C. E. 2011a. *Statius: Silvae book II*, Cambridge
- 2011b. 'The first biography of Lucan: Statius' *Silvae* 2.7', in Asso 2011: 435–51
- Newman, J. K. 1967. *Augustus and the new poetry*, Brussels
- Nisbet, R. G. M. 1978–80. 'Aeneas imperator. Roman generalship in an epic context', *PVS* 18: 50–61
- Norden, E. 1913. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, Leipzig
- Nosarti, L. 2009. 'Tessere lucanee in Draconzio e Corippo', in Walde 2009: 49–65
- Nutting, H. C. 1931–3. 'Comments on Lucan', *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 11: 105–41, 249–318
1932. 'Lucan VII 1–6', *CW* 26: 54–5
- Oakley, S. P. 1998. *A commentary on Livy books VI–X*, vol. II: *Books VII–VIII*, Oxford
2005. *A commentary on Livy books VI–X*, vol. III: *Book IX*, Oxford
2007. *A commentary on Livy books VI–X*, vol. IV: *Book X*, Oxford
- 2009a. 'Housman, Lucan and Fraenkel', in D. J. Butterfield and C. A. Stray, eds. *A. E. Housman: classical scholar* (London) 65–94
- 2009b. 'Res olim dissociabiles: emperors, senators and liberty', in A. J. Woodman, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Tacitus* (Cambridge) 184–94
- O'Hara, J. J. 1990. *Death and the optimistic prophecy*, Princeton

2017. *True names: Vergil and the Alexandrian tradition of etymological word-play*, Ann Arbor
- O'Higgins, D. 1988. 'Lucan as *uates*', *ClAnt* 7: 208–26
- Ollfors, A. 1967. *Textkritische und interpretatorische Beiträge zu Lucan*, Stockholm
- Opelt, I. 1965. *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen: eine Typologie*, Heidelberg
- Ormand, K. 1994. 'Lucan's *auctor vix fidelis*', *ClAnt* 13: 38–55; repr. in Tesoriero 2010: 324–45
- O'Sullivan, T. M. 2009. 'Death *ante ora patrum* in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *TAPhA* 139: 443–83
- Otto, A. 1890. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig
- Pagán, V. E. 2000. 'The mourning after: Statius, *Thebaid* 12', *AJPh* 121: 423–52
- Paratore, E. 1936. *L'Elegia III, 11 e gli Atteggiamenti politici di Propertio*, Palermo
- Parkin, T. 2003. *Old age in the Roman world: a cultural and social history*, Baltimore
- Pease, A. S. 1935. *M. Tulli Ciceronis De divinatione libri duo*, Darmstadt
- Pelling, C. B. R. 1973. 'Pharsalus', *Historia* 22: 249–59
2011. *Plutarch: Caesar*, translated with an introduction and commentary, Oxford
- Perotta, G. 1965. 'Lucano VII, 746–749', *StudUrb* 39: 7–17
- Pichon, R. 1912. *Les sources de Lucain*, Paris
- Pina-Polo, F. 2011. *The consul at Rome: the civil functions of the consuls in the Roman republic*, Cambridge
- Pisani, V. 1954. 'Lat. *Cautes*, toch. B *kauc A koc*', *ZVS* 72: 95–7
- Pollini, J. 2012. *From republic to empire: rhetoric, religion and power in the visual culture of ancient Rome*, Norman, Okla.
- Purcell, N. 1998. 'Discovering a Roman resort-coast: the *Litus Laurentinum* and the archaeology of *otium*', at <https://intranet.royalholloway.ac.uk/classics/research/laurentine-shore-project/documents/pdf/litus-laurentinum-english-version.pdf>, trans. N. Purcell (originally published as 'Alla scoperta di una costa residenziale romana: il *litus Laurentinum* e l'archeologia dell'*otium*', in M. G. Lauro, ed. *Castelporziano III: Campagne di scavo e restauro 1987–1991* (Rome) 11–32)
- Quint, D. 1993. *Epic and empire: politics and generic form from Virgil to Milton*, Princeton
- Radicke, J. 2004. *Lucans poetische Technik: Studien zum historischen Epos*, Leiden

- Ramnaud, M. 1955. 'L'apologie de Pompée par Lucain au livre VII de la *Pharsale*', *REL* 33: 258–96
- Rawson, B. 1970. 'Pompey and Hercules', *Antichthon* 4: 30–7
- Reed, J. D. 2011. 'The *Bellum civile* as a Roman epic', in Asso 2011: 21–31
- Roche, P. A. 2005. 'Righting the reader: conflagration and civil war in Lucan's *De bello civili*', *Scholια* 14: 52–71
2009. *Lucan: De bello civili*, book 1, Oxford
2016. 'Lucan in Claudian's *in Eutropium*: rhetoric, paradox, and exemplarity', in Nelis, Galli Milic and Berlincourt 2016: 227–42
- Rolim de Moura, A. 2010. 'Lucan 7: speeches at war', in N. Hömke and C. Reitz, eds. *Lucan's Bellum civile: between epic tradition and aesthetic innovation* (Berlin) 71–90
- Roller, M. 2001. *Constructing autocracy: aristocrats and emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome*, Princeton
- Rose, H. J. 1958. 'The dream of Pompey', *AClass* 1: 80–4
- Rosenmeyer, T. G. 1969. *The green cabinet: Theocritus and the European pastoral lyric*, Berkeley
- Rosner-Siegal, J. A. 1983. 'The oak and the lightning: Lucan, *Bellum civile* 1.135–157', *Athenaeum* 61: 165–77; repr. in Tesoriero 2010: 184–200
- Rutherford, R. B. 1992. *Homer: Odyssey books XIX and XX*, Cambridge
- Rutz, W. 1963. 'Die Träume des Pompeius in Lucans *Pharsalia*', *Hermes* 91: 334–45
- Sannicandro, L. 2010. *I personaggi femminili del Bellum civile di Lucano*, Rahden
- Scheid, J. 2003. *An introduction to Roman religion*, Bloomington
- Schlonski, F. 1995. *Studien zum Erzählerstandort bei Lucan*, Trier
- Scullard, H. H. 1981. *Festivals and ceremonies of the Roman republic*, Ithaca, NY
- Seager, R. 1994. 'The rise of Pompey', in *CAH* ix<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge) 208–28
2002. *Pompey the Great: a political biography*, Malden, Mass.
- Sear, F. 2006. *Roman theatres: an architectural study*, Oxford
- Seitz, K. 1965. 'Der pathetische Erzählstil Lucans', *Hermes* 93: 204–32
- Semple, W. H. 1959. 'The conclusion of Virgil's *Aeneid*: a study of the war in Latium, with special reference to Books XI and XII', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 42: 175–93
- Seo, J. M. 2013. *Exemplary traits: reading characterization in Roman poetry*, Oxford
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1956. *Propertiana*, Cambridge
1982. 'On Lucan', *PCPhS* 28: 91–100
1984. 'More on Pseudo-Quintilian's longer declamations', *HSCPh* 88: 113–37
1987. 'Lucan revisited', *PCPhS* 33: 74–91
- Sklenář, R. 2003. *The taste for nothingness: a study of virtus and related themes in Lucan's Bellum civile*, Ann Arbor

- Skutsch, O. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, Oxford
- Smith, C. J. 2012. 'The *Feriae Latinae*', in J. Rasmus Brandt and J. W. Iddeng, eds. *Greek and Roman festivals: content, meaning, and practice* (Oxford) 267–88
- Smolenaars, J. J. L. 1994. *Statius: Thebaid VII. A commentary*, Leiden
- Solodow, J. 1972. Summary of 'The copulative particles in Livy' (diss., Harvard 1971), *HSCPh* 76: 303–5
- Southern, P. 2007. *The Roman army: a social and institutional history*, Oxford
- Spencer, D. 2010. *Roman landscape: culture and identity*, Cambridge
- Šterbenc Erker, D. S. 2009. 'Women's tears in ancient Roman burial', in T. Fögen, ed. *Tears in the Graeco-Roman world* (Berlin) 135–60
- Stover, T. 2014. *Epic and empire in Vespasianic Rome: a new reading of Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica*, Cambridge
- Sullivan, D. 1976. 'Innuendo and the "weighted alternative" in Tacitus', *CJ* 71: 312–26
- Syme, R. 1933. 'Some notes on the legions under Augustus', *JRS* 23: 14–33
1986. *The Augustan aristocracy*, Oxford
- Syndikus, H. P. 1958. *Lucans Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg: Untersuchungen zur epischen Technik und zu den Grundlagen des Werkes*, Munich
- Tarrant, R. J. 1976. *Seneca: Agamemnon*, Cambridge
1983. 'Lucan', in L. D. Reynolds, ed. *Texts and transmission: a survey of the Latin classics* (Oxford) 215–18
1997. 'Poetry and power: Virgil's poetry in contemporary context', in C. Martindale, ed. *The Cambridge companion to Virgil* (Cambridge) 169–87
2012. *Virgil: Aeneid XII*, Cambridge
- Tesoriero, C. A. 2000. 'A commentary on Lucan, *Bellum civile* 6.333–830', diss., Sydney
- ed. 2010. *Oxford readings in classical studies: Lucan*, Oxford
- Thomas, R. F. 1982. 'Catullus and the polemics of poetic reference (64.1–18)', *AJPh* 103: 144–64
1988. *Virgil: Georgics*, Cambridge
- Thompson, L. 1956. 'Lucan's *Bellum civile* and the tragedies of Seneca', diss., Chicago
- Thorne, M. A. 2011. 'Memoria redux: memory in Lucan', in Asso 2011: 363–82
- Thornton, A. 1976. *The living universe: gods and men in Virgil's Aeneid*, Leiden
- Trampe, E. 1884. *De Lucani arte metrica*, Berlin
- Vessey, D. 1973. *Statius and the Thebaid*, Cambridge
- Vian, F. 1952. *La guerre des géants: le mythe avant l'époque hellénistique*, Paris
- Walde, C. 2001. *Die Traumdarstellungen in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung*, Munich

- ed. 2009. *Lucans Bellum civile: Studien zum Spektrum seiner Rezeption von der Antike bis ins 19. Jahrhundert*, Trier
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1982. 'Civilis princeps: between citizen and king', *JRS* 72: 32–48
- Walter, J. 2009. 'Christianorum Lucanus? Zur Lucan- (und Seneca-) Rezeption in Gewaltdarstellungen bei Prudentius', in Walde 2009: 9–48.
- Wardle, D. 2006. *Cicero: On divination book one*, Oxford
- Ware, C. 2012. *Claudian and the Roman epic tradition*, Cambridge
- Warren, J. ed. 2009. *The Cambridge companion to Epicureanism*, Cambridge
- Watson, L. C. 2003. *A commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford
- Watson, P. 1985. 'Axelson revisited: the selection of vocabulary in Latin poetry', *CQ* 35: 430–48
- Webb, R. 2009. *Ekphrasis, imagination and persuasion in ancient rhetorical practice and theory*, Farnham
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*, Oxford
- Welch, K. 2010. 'Nimium felix: Caesar's felicitas and Cicero's *Philippics*', in T. Stevenson and M. Wilson, eds. *Cicero's Philippics: history, rhetoric and ideology* (Auckland) 181–213
2012. *Magnus Pius: Sextus Pompeius and the transformation of the Roman republic. Roman culture in an age of civil war*, Swansea
- Wheeler, J. forthcoming. 'The elements of slaughter: on a prophetic acrostic in Lucan, *Bellum civile* 7.153–58', *Classical Philology*
- Wick, C. 2004. *M. Annaeus Lucanus: Bellum civile liber IX. Kommentar*, Munich
- Wilkinson, L. P. 1963. *Golden Latin artistry*. Cambridge
- Williams, G. 1968. *Tradition and originality in Roman poetry*, Oxford
1983. *Technique and ideas in the Aeneid*, New Haven
- Wills, J. 1996. *Repetition in Latin poetry: figures of allusion*, Oxford
- Wirszubski, C. H. 1968. *Libertas as a political idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*, Cambridge
- Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Munich
- Woodman, A. J. 2014. *Tacitus: Agricola*, Cambridge
1983. 'From Hannibal to Hitler: the literature of war', *University of Leeds Review* 26: 107–24
- Zanker, G. 1981. 'Enlargeia in ancient criticism of poetry', *RhM* 124: 297–311
- Zanker, P. 1988. *The power of images in the age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Zissos, A. 2008. *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica book I*, Oxford

# INDEXES

*Italic numbers refer to pages in the Introduction, non-italic numbers refer to line numbers in the commentary.*

## 1 SUBJECTS AND NAMES

### ablative

- absolute, 17-18, 79, 145, 329-30,  
467-8, 553, 564, 612, 621-2,  
660, 664, 671-2, 676-7, 746-9,  
752, 766, 782, 785-6, 802

### causal, 103

- of attendant circumstances, 269
- of comparison, 685-6
- of description, 241-2
- of distance, 298-9
- of duration of time, 72-3
- of instrument, 713-15, 790
- of manner, 332-3, 385-6, 468-9
- of means, 133, 352-3, 847-9
- of price, 92-3, 282-3, 751, 757
- of respect, 403-4
- of separation, 57
- of source, 836-7
- of starting point, 1
- of time, 783

### acrostic, 151-7

### Actium, 872

### adjectives

- in *-ficus*, 2
- noun-based instead of genitive, 6,  
146, 149, 569-70
- with concessive force, 266

### aegis, 149

### Aemilii Lepidi, 583-4

### Aemilius Paullus, L., 799-800

### aetiology and epic, 617-46

### Afranius, L., 45-61, 78

### Allia, 408-9, 632-3

### Allobrogian chieftains, 231

### altar of Artemis in Tauris, 777

### alternative explanations, 19-23, 172-3

### amputation wounds, 623

- anaphora, 40-2, 75, 79, 92-4, 114-15,  
122-3, 182-3, 189, 301-2, 350,  
375-6, 421-2, 497-8, 709-10,  
718-19, 785-6, 813, 821-2,  
847-9, 870

### anastrophe, 2-3, 48-9, 588

- anger, 15, 16, 65, 103, 354-5, 385-6,  
786-824

### animals plunder the dead, 825-46

### Antenor, 194

### Antonius, L., 871

### Antonius, M., 647, 853, 872

- ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction, 183-4, 303,  
358-9, 386

### Apollo, 19-23, 148, 777

### apostrophe, 23-4, 23, 40-2, 91-2,

- 110, 113-14, 168-71, 185-213,  
233-4, 301-2, 535-6, 545-56,  
552, 674, 675, 680-1, 698-711,  
721-2, 812, 820-4, 847-72,  
869

### Arabia Felix, 442-3

### Arabs, 514

### Aras (river), 188

### Arausio, 632-3

- archers, 139-43, 141-2, 229-30,  
506-44, 508

### Argos, 451-2, 453-4

### Arimaspeans, 756

- Ariminum, 1-6, 245-8, 250-329,  
475-7

### Arminians, 540-2

- Asinius Pollio, C., 116, 217-23, 292-4,  
474, 475-84

### Assyria, 635-6

### astral immortality, 816

### asyndeton, 92-4, 97-101, 107-9,

- 122-3, 195, 379-80, 635-6,  
705, 813, 818-19, 821-2, 870

### Athena, 149, 569-71

### Atreus, 451-2

### augury, 19-23, 185-213, 437-9

### battle, 2-5, 65, 101-4, 117-19,

- 185-213, 242-3, 250-329,  
418-19, 453-4, 464-5, 470-5,  
496, 497-8, 506-46, 571,  
597-616, 617-46, 647-97,  
825-46, 847-72

### aftermath scenes, 787

- avoided by Pompey, 45-61, 102,  
109

### between brothers and fathers, 550

### cry, 273-4

### centre, 545-56



- delayed in *BC* 7, 2-4  
 demanded by Pompeians, 45-61  
 food before, 331  
 prayed for by Caesar, 113-14  
 signal, 82-3, 475-84  
 Bellona, 560-7, 568, 569  
 birds of prey, 828-9, 831-4, 836-7  
   dripping blood, dropping limbs,  
     838-40  
 Bistones, 569, 826  
 blood, 23, 387-99, 503, 506-44,  
   579-81, 605-6, 621-2, 625-6,  
   797, 825, 836-7, 838, 847-72;  
   *see also* rivers, of blood  
 Boebeis (lake), 176  
 Brutus, *see* Iunius Brutus, L.  
 Brutus (the Liberator), *see* Iunius  
   Brutus, M.  
 burial, 33-6, 786-825, 809-11, 838-40  
  
 Cadiz/Gades, 187-8  
 Caecilii Metelli, 583-4  
 Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica,  
   Q., 45-61, 222-3, 540-2,  
   583-4, 599-600, 691  
 Caesar (as author), 11  
 Caesar (as character)  
   all or nothing mentality, 264-5,  
     380-2  
   and Achilles, 13  
   and Aeneas, 13, 14  
   and Agave, 780  
   and Bellona, 568  
   and Hannibal, 250-329, 786-824  
   and his soldiers, 10, 334-6, 560-7  
   and Mars, 569  
   and Pentheus, 780  
   and the gods, 6, 8, 798-9  
   and Turnus, 14, 569-71  
   assassination foreshadowed, 782  
   assimilated to his troops, 334-6  
   at Rubicon, 238-9, 245-8, 254-5  
   audacity, 246-7  
   breakfast amid the dead, 792  
   characterization, 10  
   clemency, 312-13, 318-19, 349-  
     55  
   denies burial, 10, 786-824  
   dice, 238-9  
   fear of, 40  
   feigned *ciuitas*, 267  
   *furor*, 10, 14, 557  
   gazes upon dead, 786-824,  
   hesitation, 8, 245-8, 339-41  
   in Rome, 701-2  
   *ira*, 10, 802  
   like a thunderbolt, 133-4, 339-40  
   madness, *rabies*, 18, 245  
   marches away from Pharsalus, 820-4  
   soul, 816  
   speech to troops, 250-329  
   speed, 241-2  
   suicide idal imagery, 252, 303-17,  
     326-8, 380-2  
   triumphs, 42, 43, 256, 738  
   visions of battle 292-4, 636-7  
   witness of troops, 250-329, 286-7  
 Caesarians, the  
   bespattered by blood, 838  
   hesitate before crime 466-9  
   plunder Pompey's camp, 736-7,  
     740-2  
   post-battle dreams, 760-86  
 Camillus, *see* Furius Camillus, M.  
 Cannae, 408-9, 632-3  
 Cappadocia, Cappadocians, 225-6,  
   540-2  
 Cassius Longinus, C., 447-8, 449, 451,  
   583-4, 651, 831-2, 853  
 cataclysm, 50, 134-7, 151-7, 195, 244,  
   660  
 Catiline, *see* Sergius Catilina, L.  
 Cato the Younger  
   and Brutus, 586-96  
   death foreshadowed, 597-616,  
     691  
   eulogy of Pompey, 267  
   mutiny of troops in *BC*, 9, 45-61  
   not at Pharsalus, 45-61, 62-85  
   wished-for *deuotio*, 117-19, 652-3  
 Caudine Forks, 632-3  
 Chalybes, 517-18  
 chance, 7, 504-5, 586-96; *see also*  
   fortune  
 chiasmus, 8, 85-6, 107-9, 117-19,  
   120-1, 172-3, 182-3, 190-1,  
   199-200, 207, 314-15, 371-2,  
   374-5, 379-8, 435, 453-4,  
   501-2, 550, 574, 588, 633-5,  
   660, 683-4, 774-6  
 Cicero, 6, 62-85, 87-90, 305  
 Cilicians, 222-3, 540-2  
 Cleopatra, 872  
 clausal devices, 44, 454-5, 786-824,  
   844-5, 845-6, 847-72  
 Colline Gate, Battle of, 306  
 compendious comparison, 100-1,  
   144, 633-5, 867

- conditionals  
   contrary to fact, 37-9, 204, 860-8  
   future less vivid, 569-70  
   future more vivid, 310, 323-5  
   implied, 664, 671-2, 674  
   mixed, 334-6, 352-3  
 confined spaces in *BC*, 221-2, 315-16, 518-19  
 conflagration, 812-15  
 consuls, 440-1  
 Corfinium, 219-20, 597-616, 600-1, 604  
 Cornelia, 661, 676-7  
 Cornelius, C. (augur), 12, 185-213  
 Cornelius Lentulus Crus, L., 45-61, 217-23  
 Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, P., 45-61  
 Cornelius Sulla Felix, L., 16, 47-8, 250-329, 447-8, 617-46, 838  
 corpses, 23, 722  
   fertilizing fields, 851  
 Corus (north-west wind), 125-7  
 Corvini, 583-4  
 Crastinus, 51, 245, 288-9, 470-5, 597-616  
 crucifixion, 304  
 Curio, *see* Scribonius Curio, C.  
 Curius Dentatus, M'., 358-9  
 Cyclopes, 146, 147, 150  
 Cydonea, 229-30  
  
 dactylic rhythm, 3, 590  
 Dahae, 429  
 date of agent, 331, 434, 511, 676-7  
 dawn, 1-6  
 death, 4, 5, 117-19, 308-9, 352-3, 418-19, 470-1, 583-4, 586-96, 597-616, 617-46, 647-97, 683-4, 818  
 decapitation, 117-19, 626-8  
 decay, decomposition, 791, 810, 811, 845-6  
 Decius Mus, P., the Decii, 358-9  
 delay, 3-4, 1-6, 45-61, 87-8, 241-2, 250-329, 295-6, 338-9, 583, 647-97  
 desecration of tombs, 855  
*deuotio*, 358-9, 647-97; *see also* Cato the Younger; Pompey  
 diction, 20  
 Dido's pyre, 806-8  
 Diomedes (Bistonian king), 826  
 dogs, 828-9, 829-30  
  
 Domitius Ahenobarbus, L., 14, 45-61, 217-23, 583-4, 597-604, 606-9, 617-46  
 dreams  
   anxiety dreams, 19-20  
   delusive, 21-2  
   of the Caesarians, 760-86  
   Pompey's, 7-44  
 Dyrrachium, 45-61, 62-85, 151-7, 217-18, 315-17, 411, 583-4, 786-824, 868  
  
 Ebro (river), 15  
 Egypt, 217-18, 711, 832-4, 847-72  
 ekpyrosis, 136  
 elision, 27-8, 815-16  
 ellipsis, 17-18, 28, 71, 323-5  
 emotions, 8, 16, 17-21, 9-10, 40-2, 53-4, 185-213, 337-84, 339-41, 341, 350, 385-6, 385, 555, 701, 812, 847-9  
 emotive juxtaposition, 30, 53, 282-3, 564, 597-8  
 emperor, 268, 385-459, 440-1, 457-8  
 enallage, 98, 214, 308-9, 533, 699-700  
 end of the war, 343-4  
 Enipeus (river), 116, 224  
 enjambment, 26, 62-3, 84-5, 91-2, 108-9, 119-20, 134-5, 173-4, 182-3, 212-13, 223, 238-9, 246, 270-2, 273-4, 290-2, 309-10, 340-1, 358-9, 360, 445-6, 446-7, 455-6, 623-4, 626-8, 642-3, 660-1, 664, 671-2, 728-9, 772-3, 789, 790-1, 824  
 Epicureanism, 7-8, 19-23, 311-12, 445-6, 447-8, 454-5, 470-1, 591, 786-824, 810-11  
 Erichtho, 1-6, 168-71, 168-9, 169-70, 171, 565, 662, 786-824  
 etymologies, etymological wordplay, 15, 145, 153, 308-9, 350-1, 397-8, 689-90, 709-10, 721-2  
 Eumenides, 168-9, 775, 777-80  
 exhortation (*paraceleusis*), 250-329, 337-84  
   closural devices of, 277-80  
   common topoi, 251, 337-84, 342-3, 346-8 ; consequences of defeat, 303-17; denigration of enemy on ethnic grounds, 269-70; promise of riches, 299-300; words unnecessary to inspire courage, 295-6

- face as index of character, 290-2, 682  
 famine, 98  
 fate, 7, 1, 29, 45-61, 47, 62-85, 85-127, 85-6, 247-8, 295-6, 332-3, 504-6, 586-96, 676-7, 705  
     multiple names, 1, 504-5  
 Favonius, M., 45-61  
 fear, 19-20, 40, 102, 104-5, 105-7, 133-4, 134-7, 138, 172-3, 185-213, 245-8, 297, 337-84, 386, 413, 466-9, 525, 586-96, 615, 626-8, 644-5  
 Feriae Latinae, 395-6  
 financial language, 490, 610, 617-18, 751, 787; *see also* ablative, of price  
 focalization (point of view), 27, 144-50, 241-2, 415, 508, 523, 725, 783, 797  
 fortune, 7-44, 14, 20-4, 24, 68, 107-8, 111, 235, 250-1, 416-17, 418-19, 487-8, 504-5, 586-96, 601-2, 648-9, 685-6, 796, 818; *see also* chance  
 Furies, 764, 771-2, 778  
 Furius Camillus, M., 12, 45-61, 358-9, 647-97  
 Gauls, 231, 540-2  
 gaze, 16-17, 369-76, 447-8, 629-30, 649, 674-5, 682, 695-6, 786-824  
     evaluative, 250-329, 629-30  
 generals, (good) generalship  
     characteristics, 20, 45-61, 87-8, 139-43, 223, 250-1, 286-7, 290-2, 560-7, 566-7, 574, 647-9  
     inability to see details of battle, 651  
 genitive  
     contracted form, 219-20  
     of characteristic, 354-5  
     of definition, 847-9  
     of description, 54-5  
     of fullness, 225-6  
     of material, 272-3  
     of quality, 279-80  
     of reference, 240  
     of value, 669  
     partitive, 423  
     pronoun instead of adjective to express possession, 676  
 gigantomachy, 144-50, 151-7, 153, 155, 156-7, 173-4, 671-2  
 gladiatorial imagery, 17, 426-7, 695-6  
 gods and religion, 5-7, 1, 30, 76, 85-6, 113-14, 151-7, 172-3, 311-12, 337-84, 385-459, 479, 796, 798-9, 869  
 golden line, 27, 8, 64, 160, 167, 457, 859  
 guilt, 45-61, 69-70, 117-19, 160, 250-329, 449, 455-6, 487-8, 514-20, 626-8, 760-86, 798-9, 847-72, 869, 870  
 Haemon, 825  
 Haemus (mountain range), 174, 480-4  
 Hannibal, 12, 240, 250-329, 332-3, 408-9, 786-824, 799-800  
 happiness, joy, 20-21  
 hendiadys, 63, 352-3  
 Hercules' pyre, 806-8  
 historic present tense (secondary sequence after), 54-5, 131-2, 238-9, 639-40  
 historiographical tone, 15, 57, 93, 107-8, 120-1, 192, 231, 242, 759  
 Homer  
     *Iliad* and *BC* 7, 13  
     Patroclus, 14  
 hope, 20, 185-213, 211, 247-8, 255, 297, 386, 615, 688  
 'hostages to fortune', 662  
 hyperbaton, 26-7, 73-4, 77-8, 125-7, 131-2, 153, 171, 196, 199-202, 207, 227-8, 263, 274-5, 358-9, 363-4, 373, 400-1, 437-9, 442-3, 477-8, 553-4, 632-3, 728-9, 735, 777, 836-7, 856-7  
 hyperbole, 22-3, 69-70, 128-9, 196, 208, 264-5, 278-80, 294, 304, 363-4, 399-400, 477-8, 519-20, 552, 601-2, 621-2, 632-3, 636-7, 671-2, 703, 749-50, 791, 794-5, 800, 836-7, 839, 840, 851, 853-4, 870  
 Ides of March, 782  
 India, 427-8  
 indirect command, 68, 71, 656-8  
 indirect question, 91-2, 132, 172-3, 190-1, 253, 259-60, 281-2, 462-4, 554, 560-70, 579-81, 617-46, 619, 809  
 Itryraei, 230, 514-20  
 Iunius Brutus, L., 39, 440, 589  
 Iunius Brutus, M., 14, 586-96

- Juba, 229-30  
 Jupiter, 14, 36, 137, 150, 162, 447-9, 453-4  
 juxtaposition, 17, 30, 83, 107-9, 133-4, 134-5, 138, 144, 168-9, 188, 402, 633-5, 664, 770  
 killing of relatives, 34, 453-4, 545-56, 626-8  
 kings in Pompey's forces, 45-61, 62-3, 69-70, 73-4, 227-8, 275-6, 548-9  
 ktisis, 131-2  
 Labienus, T., 629-30, 692  
 Laelius, 182-3, 318-22  
 Larisa, 647-97, 712-27, 712  
 Latium and its towns (incl. Cora), 391-6  
 legal language, 26, 54-5  
 Lentulus, *see* Cornelius Lentulus Crus  
 Lentulus Spinther, *see* Cornelius Lentulus Spinther  
 Lepidi, *see* Aemilii Lepidi  
 Leucas, 872  
 Libertas personified, 432-6  
 Libya, 45-61, 223, 229-30, 711, lightning storm, 151-7  
 linguistic diversity of army, 272-3  
 lions, 827  
 Livy, 11-12  
 Lucretius, 8  
 madness, 18, 1-6, 45-61, 125-7, 151-84, 169-70, 183-4, 496, 556, 557, 647-9  
 Maenads, 764, 780  
 Manlii Torquati, 583-4  
 manuscripts, 28-9  
 Marius, C., 14, 168-9, 305, 455-6, 617-46  
 Marius Gratidianus, M., 322  
 Massilia, 219-20, 241-2, 562, 597-616  
 medical language, 412, 466-7, 625-6  
 Metelli, *see* Caecilii Metelli  
 Metellus, *see* Caecilii Metellus  
 metre, 27-8; *see also* dactylic rhythm; spondaic lines and feet  
 Mezentius, 597-616  
 military language, 26, 15, 54-5, 77-8, 93-4, 214, 216-17, 220, 222-3, 231, 278, 328-9, 416-18, 497, 626-8, 702, 733  
 Mimas (mountain range), 450  
 Munda, 692, 871  
 Mutina, 872  
 mutiny, 19-23, 45-61, 245, 250-329, 342-3  
 Mycenae, 451-4  
 Mytilene, 715, 724  
 narrator  
 and apostrophe, 168-71, 674-6, 812, 832-4, 847-72  
 and the gods, 45-61, 349-55, 349, 798-9  
 impassioned, 7-44  
 not omniscient, 6, 19-23, 190-1  
 obstructive, 1-6  
 obtrusive, 23-4, 7-44, 58, 385-459  
 partisan, 6, 36, 144-50, 185-213, 339-41  
 reluctant/refusing to narrate, 3-4, 1-6, 20, 545-56, 617-46  
 varies point of view, 397-8, 415, 640, 693-6, 845-6  
*uates*, 185-213, 553  
 vivid narration, 185-213  
 Nero, 19-23, 219-20, 458, 597-616  
 neuter adjective as subject with adnominal genitive, 107-8, 683-4  
 night watch (in military camp), 25  
 Nisus and Euryalus, 183-213  
 Numa, 395-6  
 Odysseus, 45-61  
 Oeta (mountain), 449  
 Olympus (mountain), 173-4  
*omen/nomen* nexus, 22  
 omission, silence, 4-5  
 Orestes, 777-80  
 Orodes, 597-616  
 Ossa (mountain), 173-6  
 oxymora, 64, 227-8  
 Pachynus, 871  
 Pangaea (mountain), 480-4  
*paraceleusis*, *see* exhortation  
 paradox, 21-2, 19, 22, 43, 65, 68, 78, 98-9, 107-9, 109, 113-14, 153, 183, 185-213, 233-4, 256, 262, 273-4, 277-8, 311-12, 334, 366-8, 375-6, 382-6, 397-8, 400-1, 404-6, 432-6, 457, 501-2, 526-7, 533-5, 540, 639-40, 664, 701, 706, 713-14, 718, 727-9, 746, 771-2, 780, 794-5, 802-3, 823-4, 870

- Parthia, 14, 17-18, 217-19, 423, 429,  
442-3, 703, 711
- participle in place of a clause, 47-8,  
566-7, 674, 814-15
- pathetic fallacy, 483
- pathos, 24, 7-44, 376-7, 415, 464-5,  
555, 786-824, 844-5
- Patroclus, 597-616, 626-8
- Pelion (mountain), 481
- Pelops, 778
- Pentheus, 780
- periphrasis, 15, 23, 33, 48-9, 92-3,  
151-2, 207, 227-8, 301-2, 345,  
363-4, 421-2, 605-6, 704, 813
- Perugia, siege of, 871
- Petronius, 6
- Pharos, 692
- Pharsalus  
absence of individual battle  
narratives, 4-5, 617-46  
casualties, 85-127, 385-459, 387-  
99, 399-400, 418-19, 583-4,  
599-600, 617-46, 647-97, 855  
commemorated on *fasti*, 410-11  
consequences, 385-459, 580-1  
denounced by narrator, 617-46  
modes of viewing, 447-8  
*see also* battle
- Philippi (and Battle of), 480-4, 583-4,  
592, 651, 831-2, 853
- philosophical tone, 104, 612-13
- Phlegra, 145
- Pholoe (mountain), 449
- Pindus (mountain), 173-4, 482
- polyptoton, 92-4, 374-5, 421-2, 573,  
645-6, 683-4, 821-2, 836-7
- Pompeians, the, 13  
arrangement on battlefield, 217-23  
as Virgil's Italians, 139-43  
cavalry, 225-6, 506-44  
compared to Olympian gods,  
144-50  
fear, 19, 172-3  
Greek contingents, 635-6  
madness, 18, 45-61  
prepare weapons for battle, 139-43  
responses to Pompey's speeches,  
337-84, 382-4  
rush to death, 668-9
- Pompey  
accused of prolonging the war,  
45-61, 52-5  
being fearful, 52  
being slow 52, 73-4  
being too tolerant of Caesar, 53  
indulging in world rule, 53-4,  
54-5  
and family, 369-70, 377, 662, 676-7  
and Hector, 13, 138  
and his soldiers, 9, 652-3  
and Latinus, 13, 85-127, 123-5  
and Priam, 13  
and Rome, 7-44, 29, 32-6, 91-2,  
138  
and the gods, 6-7, 657  
and Turnus, 13, 87-8, 138  
apostrophized by narrator,  
185-213  
as an exile, 379-80, 703  
backward-looking, 20, 687-8  
camp at Pharsalus, 45-61, 49,  
62-85, 75, 728-60, 740-2,  
760-86  
characterization, 8-10, 7-61,  
85-127, 337-84, 647-97  
concessions and compromises, 9,  
380-2  
decapitation, 117-19, 322  
desire to be loved, 9  
*deutio*, 117-19  
dream, 7-44  
fear, 339-41, 339-40  
flight from battle, 9-10, 19, 647-97,  
654-5, 669, 683-7, 689  
*Fortuna's* favourite, 24, 685-6  
hedging, 118-19, 378  
his age, 14  
his death, 7-44, 14, 24, 36, 40-2,  
117-19, 165-7, 597-616, 647-  
97, 676-9, 683-4  
his name (and puns thereon), 7, 22,  
101, 111, 162-3, 282-3, 378,  
669, 680-1, 693, 718  
his theatre, 9  
his triumphs, 7-44, 279-80, 685-6  
illness in 50 BCE, 352-3  
inertia, 339-40, 501-2  
no funeral monument, 36, 455-6  
no sacrificial substitute, 652-3  
self-absorption, 112, 120-1, 647-97,  
669  
speech to troops, 85-127, 337-84  
strategy at Pharsalus, 365-6,  
485-88, 506-44  
vanity, 7
- Pompeius, Cn., 692
- Pontus, 225-6
- portents and prodigies, 151-84

- praeteritio*, 617-46
- prayers, 6-7, 34, 45-61, 111, 113-14, 168-9, 185-213, 252, 312-15, 352-3, 447-8, 487-8, 657, 844-5, 847-72
- princirate/autocracy, 617-46
- as slavery, 373, 380-2, 385-49, 432-9, 641
- as unending fight, 695-6
- prosaic language, 26, 2, 54-5, 287-8
- proscriptions, 65-6, 305, 792, 798
- Ptolemy XIII, 27, 241-2, 455-6, 662, 704, 711
- puns, 22, 26, 125-7, 180-1, 545, 782, 784, 819, 860
- purpose clauses, 6, 131-2, 238-9, 412-19, 462-4, 650-1, 793-4
- relative clause
- causal, 54-5, 444-5, 793-4
  - characteristic, 355-6, 395-6
  - conditional, 310
  - expressing purpose, 131-2, 238-9, 418-19, 793-4
  - incorporation of antecedent, 342-3, 374-5
- result clause, 102, 427-8, 431, 847-9
- repetition of words, 199-200, 656-8, 766-7, 796
- rhetoric (commonplaces, effects, figures, terms), 9-10, 67, 210-14, 250-329, 269-70, 278, 297, 299-300, 337-84, 348, 369-76, 382-4, 683-4, 773, 847-9
- Rhine, 433
- Rhodope (mountain range), 450
- ritus Gabinus*, 4301
- rivers, 15, 188, 194, 433, 497-8, 504-5, 546-7, 839
- of blood 116, 292, 537, 699-700, 789-90
  - symbols of 'essentialized epic', 116, 224
  - rostra, 65-6
- ruination, 91-2, 244, 397-8, 504-5
- ruins as monuments, 397-8
- sacrifice, sacrificial imagery, 7-44, 117-19, 165-7, 171, 337-84, 350-1, 596, 622, 652-3
- Saepta, 306
- Sarmatia, Sarmatae, 430
- Scaeva, 245, 629-30
- scales (metaphor), 504-5
- Scipio, *see* Caecilius Metellus
- Scribonius Curio, C., 62-85, 65-6, 455-6, 492-4, 647-97, 847-72
- secondary sequence after perfect infinitive, 91-2
- senate, 9, 18, 19, 62-85, 87-8, 369-76, 371-2, 571-2, 583-4, 586-96, 586-7
- Seneca the Younger, 15-16
- sententiae*, 25, 61, 95-6, 109, 138, 277-8, 284-5, 348, 368, 375-6, 385-6, 454-5, 459, 487-8, 501-2, 526-7, 601-2, 645-6, 706, 727, 811, 818-19
- Sergius Catilina, L., 647-97
- Sertorius, 16
- shouting of army, 273-4
- Sibyl, 14, 292
- simple for compound form of verb, 58-9, 331, 511, 818-19
- slaves, 304, 402-3
- sources and models for *BC* 7, 11-16
- Spain, Spaniards, 540-2
- Spartacus, 16, 304
- spondaic lines and feet, 62-3, 92-4, 141-2, 215, 368, 369-70, 446-7, 539, 586-7, 608-9, 642-3, 813, 840, 862-3
- Stoicism, 7-8, 17-18, 1, 5, 46, 105-7, 136, 185-213, 186-7, 199-200, 211, 244, 301-2, 332-3, 454-5, 621-2, 699-700, 786-824, 812-15, 816
- subjunctive by attraction, 80
- sublimity, 112, 571-2
- suicide, 51-2, 252, 303-17, 308-10, 358-9, 380-2, 591, 647, 691
- Sulla, *see* Cornelius Sulla Felix
- sun's course, 2-3
- syllipsis, 330-1
- Syrians, 540-2
- Tagus (river), 755
- Tarpeian Rock, 758
- Taurus (mountain range), 225-6
- teichoscopia*, 369-76
- Thapsus, 691
- 'theme and variation', 4-5, 306, 421-2, 451-2, 519-20, 574, 576, 597-8, 633-5, 847-9
- Theoclymenus, 177-80
- theodicy, 45-61, 76-7, 349-55, 354-5
- Thessaly, 453-4, 825, 842-72
- Thyestes, 294, 451-2,

- Tigris, 433  
 Timavus (river), 194  
 toga, 17–18, 267, 430  
 tombs, monuments, 36, 847–72, 855  
 Torquati, *see* Manlii Torquati  
 totalizing tendency of *BC*, 22,  
     617–46  
 tragedy, 285–213  
 tragic error (ἁμαρτία), 59  
 tragic recognition (ἀναγνώρισις), 85–6  
 transmission of *BC*, 22–3  
 Trasimene, 632–3  
 Trebia, 632–3  
 tricolon arrangement, 97–101, 157,  
     169–70, 197–200, 264–5, 373,  
     404–6, 432–6, 755–7, 760–3,  
     785–6, 789–91, 828–30  
 triumph, 10, 233–4 (*see also* Caesar;  
     Pompey)  
 victory, transformative power of, 260,  
     264–5, 745  
 Virgil, 12–15  
     *A.* 12 and *BC* 7, 13  
     *G.* and *BC* 7, 15  
 wolves, 826  
 word order, 25–8: *see also* anastrophe;  
     hyperbaton; juxtaposition  
 wounds, 320–2, 464–5, 560–70,  
     603–4, 621–2, 623, 670  
 zodiac, 363–4  
 zones of the earth, 363–4, 866–7

## 2 LATIN WORDS

*accendere*, 49  
*adversus*, 155  
*ambages*, 21  
*Antenoreus*, 194  
*audax*, 246-7  
*Ausonius*, 33

*beatus*, 28

*caetra*, 232  
*caput*, 117-19  
*cardo*, 380-2  
*cassis*, 586-7  
*cateruas*, 337-8  
*ciuitas*, 267  
*comes*, 84-5  
*cos*, 139-40  
*cruor*, 292  
*cunei*, 12  
*cupidus* + *inf.*, 266  
*cura*, 209-10, 308-9  
*cursus*, 3, 544

*dilectus*, 33-6  
*discors*, 198-9  
*diuus*, 457  
*ducere*, 279-80

*effigies*, 10  
*Eous*, 56  
*errans stella*, 425  
*Euganeus*, 192-3  
*explicare*, 201-2

*fatum*, 6, 1, 51-2, 352-3,  
 463-2, 504-5  
*felicitas*, 7, 648-9  
*felix*, 442-3, 702  
*fortuna*, 6  
*funestus*, 27, 117-19, 167

*galea*, 178  
*gaudeo*, 177  
*gens*, 277, 421-2  
*gladius*, 81, 139  
*gymnasium*, 270-2

*haerere* + *dat.*, 35

*Hesperia*, 402-3

*imago*, 320-2, 356-7  
*immensus*, 571-2  
*impius*, 196  
*ira*, 16  
*iugulum*, 325  
*iuris esse*, 80

*labor*, 4, 209-10  
*lancea*, 288-9  
*liber* + *gen.*, 818  
*libertas*, 695-6  
*luctificus*, 2

*Magnus*, 7  
*maiori* (*abl. sing.*), 162-3  
*mirari*, 177  
*mora*, *morari*, 3  
*mouere*, 211

*ne* + *imp.*, 328  
*nefas*, 122-3  
*notare*, 197  
*nullus*, 25

*o*, 29  
*o superi*, 58  
*omnis*, 17-18

*pallor*, 129-30  
*perdere*, 33-6  
*pietas*, 250-329, 318-19, 320-2, 322,  
 760-3, 773

*polus*, 3  
*populus*, 28, 114-15, 207, 557,  
 841

*praeceps*, *praecipitare*, 51-2  
*praematurus*, 98  
*praetorium*, 48-9  
*proceres*, 69-70  
*procumbere*, 596  
*promouere*, 576  
*prosilire*, 249  
*prosternere*, 278  
*pudor*, 525  
*pugnax*, 219-20  
*purus*, 263



*quisquis*, 387–8

*rabies*, 51, 245

*ratus*, 34

*recusatio*, 268

*repente*, 236–7

*sancire*, 350–1

*sanguis*, 635–6

*secures*, 64

*sedes*, 23

*socer*, 53

*sol*, 2

*sors*, 308–9

*tollo*, 145

*torrens*, 15

*totus*, 17–18

*uagari*, 434

*uanus*, 8

*uaticinari*, 22

*uenerabilis*, 17–18

*uidere*, 238–9

*uirtus*, 103

### 3 GREEK WORDS

ἑκπληξίς, 133-4, 185-213

ἐνάργεια, *I*3, 9-10, 135, 185-213,

292-4, 304, 337-84, 369-76

εὐπάθειαι, *I*4

θαυμάζω, 177

πάθη, τὰ, *I*4

πόνος, 209-10

φόβος, 133-4

## 4 INDEX LOCORUM

Caesar

*Civ.*

3.49.2: 821  
 3.85.4: 238-9, 250-329, 331  
 3.86.2-5: 85-127, 250-329, 337-84,  
     366-8  
 3.86.2: 102  
 3.86.3: 365-6  
 3.86.4: 92-4, 101  
 3.88.6: 224  
 3.89.4: 521-2  
 3.91.3: 470-1  
 3.93.3: 506-7  
 3.93.5: 521-4  
 3.93.6: 524, 528-31  
 3.95.1: 732-4  
 3.95.2: 735  
 3.96.1: 740-2, 761  
 3.96.3: 677-9, 712  
 3.97.1: 736-7  
 3.98: 787  
 3.99.4: 792  
 3.99.5: 597-616

*Gal.*

2.13.3: 369-76  
 7.80.5: 629-30

Ennius

*Ann.* (Skutsch)

6-7: 818-19  
 156: 110  
 234-5: 318-19  
 281: 485  
 494: 111

Eur.

*frag.*

839.6-7: 810-11  
 839.8-11: 810-11

*Phoen.*

1416-17: 626-8

*Suppl.*

936: 804

Homer

*Il.*

1.4-5: 825-46  
 3.146-244: 369-76  
 4.104-40: 472  
 4.274: 530

4.451: 789-90

4.461: 616

5.495-6: 558-9

5.703-4: 617-46

7.215-16: 128-9

11.53-4: 836-7

11.934-5: 845-6

16.207-8: 251

16.333: 503

16.818-61: 597-616

18.483: 814-15

19.362-3: 214-15

21.387-8: 475-84

22.209-13: 504-5

22.296-9: 85-6

22.326-66: 597-616

*Od.*

1.161-2: 845-6

6.42-6: 479

12.260-373: 45-61

20.351-7: 177-80, 177, 178, 179-80

Horace

*Carm.*

1.1.7-8: 11-12

1.2.38-40: 564

1.12.35-6: 593-5

1.32.16: 168-9

1.35.14-16: 577

1.37.25-6: 682

2.1.21-4: 292-4

2.1.29: 116

2.8.15-16: 139-40

2.16.10: 183-4

3.5.1-2: 446-7

3.30.1-5: 397-8

*Ep.*

1.7.95: 266

2.1.16: 459

*Epod.*

16.2: 418-19

*S.*

2.2.11-13: 323-5

2.5.81-3: 125-7

2.5.102: 28

Livy

1.59.1: 560

2.1.1: 440-1

## Livy (cont.)

2.7.4: 39  
 2.13.9: 662  
 2.32.8-12: 579-81  
 2.53.2: 532-3  
 5.54.7: 579-81  
 6.23.1, 10-12: 647-97  
 6.23.12: 649-51  
 9.25.8: 532  
 10.28.6: 344  
 21.10.4: 240  
 21.43.3: 297  
 21.43.10: 342-4  
 21.43.17: 285-9  
 21.44.1: 290-2  
 22.6.3: 564  
 22.50.1: 408-9  
 22.51.5-9: 786-824  
 22.51.5: 787  
 22.52.6: 799-800  
 22.55.2: 345  
 23.8.11: 350-1  
 23.27.6-7: 492-4  
 25.12.6: 116, 539  
 30.34.10: 790-1  
 32.21.18: 579-81  
 34.49.7: 284-5  
 35.49.5: 530

## frag.

42: 472

*per.*

120: 305

## Lucretius

2.258: 330  
 2.323-30: 214-15  
 2.998: 810-11  
 2.999-1003: 810-11, 818-19  
 2.1101-3: 449  
 3.18-22: 479  
 3.70-1: 722  
 3.85-6: 346  
 3.288: 103  
 3.834: 127-8  
 3.838-41: 470-1  
 3.1018-19: 783, 784  
 4.34-5: 774  
 4.235-6: 320-2  
 4.1013-14: 19-20  
 4.1015-17: 767  
 4.1020-3: 19-20, 760-86

4.1049-51: 625-6  
 5.319-20: 818-19  
 6.600: 326  
 6.1155: 565  
 6.1216-17: 826-7

## Ovid

*Ars*

1.179: 431

*Ep.*

1.55-6: 858-9

*Met.*

1.5: 819  
 1.277-8: 736-7  
 1.278: 344  
 1.292: 134-5  
 1.772: 90  
 2.153-66: 2-3  
 4.96-7: 699-700  
 5.58: 575  
 7.62-3: 173-4  
 7.355: 134-5  
 7.505: 67  
 11.473: 676-7  
 12.390-1: 620  
 13.216-17: 8  
 15.87-9: 208-10  
 15.156-7: 809-11  
 15.823-4: 592, 853-4  
 15.871-2: 397-8

*Pont.*

2.5.69: 67

*Tr.*

1.4.11-12: 125-7

## Sallust

*Cat.*

8.1: 487-8  
 58.9: 303-17  
 60.4: 560-7  
 61: 786-824  
 61.7: 119-20  
 61.8: 626-8

## Seneca the Younger

*Ag.*

11: 793  
 44: 294  
 600: 526-7

*Ben.*

4.8.3: 1  
5.3.2: 686-7  
6.3.1: 647

*Clem.*

1.11.1: 511

*Cons. Marc.*

25-6: 816

*Cons. Polyb.*

9: 816

*De ira*

2.35.5: 783  
2.35.6: 568

*De otio*

4.2: 447-8

*Dial.*

1.4.12: 665  
3.7.1: 103  
11.5.1: 681-2

*Ep.*

83.25: 793-4  
92.35: 819  
94.29: 384

*Her. F.*

205: 250-1  
1324: 433

*Med.*

711-10: 442-3  
887: 138  
945-6: 180-1  
1027: 445-6

*Nat.*

2.31.1: 158-9  
2.53.2: 160  
6.26.3: 155

*Oed.*

1-5: 1-6  
71: 71  
72: 668  
329: 183-4  
604-6: 834-5

732-4: 475-6  
789: 179-80

*Phoen.*

635-6: 794-5

*Thy.*

87-8: 768-9  
203-4: 348  
260: 779  
369-70: 569  
641-3: 593-5  
720-1: 211  
750-1: 825  
784-7: 1-6  
789-884: 451-2  
957-8: 186-7  
1097-8: 558

*Trø.*

34: 185-6  
43-4: 122-3  
703-4: 180-1

## Sophocles

*Ant.*

1015-18: 838-40  
1040-2: 838-40

## Virgil

*A.*

1.150: 512, 574  
1.204-6: 23  
1.208-9: 240, 248, 341  
1.242-9: 194  
1.278-9: 137  
1.282: 284-5  
1.356: 787  
1.717-18: 789  
2.95: 256  
2.223-4: 165-6  
2.281: 588  
2.324-5: 195  
2.335: 111  
2.383: 60  
2.411: 571  
2.422-3: 287-8  
2.521-3: 87-8  
3.30: 467-8  
3.288: 746  
3.625-6: 294  
4.78: 311-12

## Virgil (cont.)

4.206-18: 447-8  
 4.469-73: 777-80  
 4.499: 129-30  
 4.582: 794-5  
 4.614: 35  
 5.3-5: 806-8  
 6.1: 123-5  
 6.87: 116  
 6.93-4: 407-8  
 6.98-9: 21  
 6.235: 589  
 6.377: 657  
 6.550: 15  
 6.773-6: 391-6  
 6.819-20: 64  
 6.824-5: 358-9  
 6.833: 579-81, 721-2  
 6.871-2: 768  
 6.872-3: 482  
 7.145: 131-2  
 7.224: 6  
 7.340: 60  
 7.351: 768-9  
 7.460-2: 496  
 7.475: 246-7  
 7.511-18: 475-84  
 7.594-600: 85-127  
 7.599-600: 123-5  
 7.626-40: 139-40  
 7.627: 139-40  
 7.636: 148  
 8.4-5: 127-8  
 8.435-8: 149  
 8.508-9: 371-2  
 8.537-40: 114-16  
 8.556-7: 543-4  
 8.691-3: 173-4  
 8.700-3: 568, 569  
 9.52-3: 472  
 9.204: 677-9  
 9.222: 235  
 9.340: 413  
 9.400-1: 669-70  
 9.455-6: 699-700  
 9.485: 825-46  
 9.588-9: 512-13  
 9.609-10: 577  
 10.279: 251  
 10.280-1: 347  
 10.361: 546-7  
 10.432-3: 494-5  
 10.501: 202-3  
 10.508: 791  
 10.739-46: 597-616  
 10.773: 252

10.843: 186-7  
 10.858-9: 180-1  
 10.870-1: 37  
 11.289-90: 546-7  
 11.372: 730-1  
 11.479-80: 407-8  
 11.591: 324  
 11.664-5: 617-46  
 11.669: 605-6  
 11.721-4: 838-40  
 11.831: 616  
 11.832: 571-2  
 12.11: 87-8  
 12.80: 348  
 12.140-1: 447-8  
 12.171: 165-6  
 12.247-56: 838-40  
 12.258-68: 472  
 12.331-3: 569-71  
 12.457-8: 497  
 12.485: 3  
 12.493: 158  
 12.647: 85-6  
 12.665-8: 339-41  
 12.725-7: 504-5  
 12.789: 139  
 12.793: 343-4  
 12.870-1: 38-9  
 12.951: 608-9  
 12.952: 616

*Ecl.*

1.40-1: 297-8  
 2.65: 330  
 4.6: 432-6  
 8.35: 454-5

*G.*

1.60-1: 1  
 1.131: 130  
 1.199-200: 426-7  
 1.328-33: 450  
 1.470: 828-9  
 1.489-92: 592, 847-72  
 1.491: 116  
 1.493-7: 538  
 1.506: 114-15  
 2.179: 358-9  
 2.279-83: 214-15  
 2.478: 4  
 2.508-10: 11-12  
 4.2: 552  
 4.173: 146  
 4.176: 144  
 4.468: 770